Vol. XXXVII JULY, 1960 No. 3

THE AUSTRALASIAN
Catholic Record

The Official Organ for communications issued by the Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.

Announcements

MSS, queries and books for review, should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited. Name and address, even if not intended for publication, must accompany all queries.

Notice of change of address, and correspondence about missing and back numbers, should be addressed to the Manager, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

SUBSCRIPTIONS: £1 *per annum in advance.*

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque.

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests are acting as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—*A.C.R.* Staff.
Archdiocese of Perth—Rt. Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D., South Perth, W.A.
Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. T. Duffy, Tawa Flat, N.Z.
Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Dulwich, S.A.
Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. V. Carroll, P.P., Kingaroy, Q.
Archdiocese of Hobart — Rev. R. Donohoe, Kingston, Tas.
Archdiocese of Canberra and Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, P.P., Tumut, N.S.W.
Diocese of Armidale—Very Rev. C. Fisher, Armidale, N.S.W.
Diocese of Auckland—Rt. Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Hamilton, N.Z.
Diocese of Ballarat—Rt. Rev. J. H. Gleeson, R.I., V.F., Terang, Vic.
Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. J. Cass, Bathurst, N.S.W.
Diocese of Bunbury — Rt. Rev. C. Cunningham, V.G., Albany, W.A.
Diocese of Christchurch—V. Rev. G. Kane, Adm., Christchurch, N.Z.
Diocese of Darwin—Rev. W. Henschke, M.S.C., Darwin, N.T.
Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. A. Loughnan, St. Mary's, Dunedin, N.Z.
Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. N. Tobin, Leonora, W.A.
Diocese of Lismore — Rt. Rev. T. Morris, P.P., V.F., Smithtown, N.S.W.
Diocese of Maitland—Rev. T. Cronin, Merewether Beach, N.S.W.
Diocese of Port Pirie — Very Rev. W. Kain, R.I., V.F., Pekina, S.A.
Diocese of Rockhampton — Rt. Rev. D. Tiernan, Rockhampton, Q.
Diocese of Sale—Rt. Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Leongatha, V.
Diocese of Sandhurst—Very Rev. J. Hussey, P.P., Wangaratta, V.
Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. M. Mahon, Adm., Warwick, Q.
Diocese of Townsville—Rt. Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.
Diocese of Wagga—Rev. J. Byrne, Tocumwal, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes — Rt. Rev. J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.
Diocese of Wollongong—Rev. W. J. Neilson, Thirroul, N.S.W.
Abbacy of New Norcia—Rev. R. Hynes, P.P., Wyalkatchem, W.A.

Editor:
V. Rev. Mgr. T. VEECH.

Manager: REV. F. A. MECHAM,
St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

The

Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." *St. Augustine.*

Contents:

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.
Right Rev. Mgr. William Leonard, D.D., D.S.S. 177
Papal Allocution on golden jubilee of the Biblical Institute —Decree of Holy Office on distribution of Holy Communion in the evening—Prohibition of books—Prayer attributed to Pope Clement XI to be inserted in future editions of Missal—Decree on Leonine Prayers—Indulgence for kissing the wedding ring.

BISHOP MURRAY SETTLES INTO MAITLAND: 1867.
Robert A. Daly, M.Sc.Agr. 189

SHARING OUR FAITH THROUGH THE CATHOLIC ENQUIRY CENTRE. Rev. Thomas A. White 202

MORAL THEOLOGY. Right Rev. Mgr. James Madden, D.D. 206
Mixed marriages and the education of children—Obligation to avoid danger of contracting mixed marriage—Marriage of lax Catholics.

CANON LAW Right Rev. Mgr. George Gallen, D.C.L. 219
Position concerning Rite of a non-Catholic of the Oriental Rite on his conversion to the Catholic Church—Effect of his conversion concerning the Rite of the children of his marriage—War pension and religious of simple vows.

LITURGY. Rev. Patrick Murphy, D.D. 230
Decree of the Holy Office on the distribution of Communion in the afternoon and evening.

HOMILETICS. Rev. Kevin Walsh, D.D. 241
Baptism and Transfiguration—II. The Transfiguration of Christ.

NOTES. 248
Some Recent Books (Very Rev. John Meagher, S.J., Very Rev. Mgr. T. Veech).

BOOK REVIEWS 257
Theologiae Dogmaticae Praelectiones. Vol. III, De Deo Creante et Elevante (Most Rev. T. Muldoon); The Supreme Moderator of Clerical Exempt Religious Institutes (Grajewski); Catholics and Divorce (Ed. O'Mahony); Mother of Perpetual Succour Manual (Cummins); Apparitions of Our Lady (Lochet); Life of Union With Mary (Neubert).

SHORT NOTICES. 188, 240, 247

Nihil Obstat:

THOMAS HARRINGTON
CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur:

✠ N. T. CARD. GILROY,
ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

1a die Julii, 1960.

Official Documents

ALLOCUTION

Delivered by the Holy Father at the golden jubilee of the Biblical Institute founded by his predecessor St. Pius X.

(February 17, 1960.)

Venerable Brethren and Beloved Sons,

We have appreciated the opportune and laudable project, which is being realised to-day—that of commemorating the first 50 years of the life of the Papal Biblical Institute. Your joy is great, and you have manifested it to Us in all its intensity. It could not be otherwise, for those years of history—as has been well said by Our beloved son, Cardinal Augustinus Bea—have been filled with abundant fruits and consolations. They have been blessed with the blessings of heaven. That great privilege of origin, which the Institute has, would be sufficient of itself to give the characteristic touch of perennial joy to its years. The Institute drew its origin from the luminous thought of St. Pius X. We are therefore glad to be able, this day, to raise the hymn of thanksgiving to the Lord for all the graces with which He has blessed these first ten lustres of your activity.

We are indeed greatly pleased to have this occasion of manifesting to you Our paternal interest and benevolence. In founding this Institution of his pontifical providence, the great Pontiff, who preceded Us, with luminous examples, both on the Chair of St. Mark, and the infallible Chair of Peter, "showed the high measure of his clear-sightedness as universal Teacher and Shepherd." Neither can We be silent about the pleasure We feel at seeing the symbolic Lion of St. Mark on your shield, as it is on Ours. These motives centring in the bonds, which unite you so closely to the Holy Pontiff Pius X and to Ourselves, entwine themselves sweetly in Our memory, and go to form that esteem for your Institute which we are solemnly proclaiming to-day in such happy circumstances.

Fifty years of life, of growth, of serious and silent work seem at once to call for a pause of recollection. Such a pause enables you to look at the course accomplished, and directs your eyes to the horizon which opens for future activity.

1. A look backward over the salient stages of this first half-century of the life of the Biblical Institute—as you, Lord Cardinal, so well-deserving yourself of the development of this Pontifical Foundation, have shown in living and speaking pictures—a look backward, We say, evokes profound gratitude to the Lord for the uninterrupted series of splendid benefits which He has showered upon this Papal Biblical Institute. Innumerable motives of gratitude spring up before you, as you consider even rapidly those years so dense with significance: a foundation made amongst many difficulties and not without opposition, soon however standing in a happy economic security: a work developing with vigorous increase, seeing its students grow in numbers, its didactic means and its scientific publications multiplying beyond all expected proportion. This history is, indeed, resplendent with the paternal solicitude of the Holy Founder, as likewise with the enlightened zeal of Our immediate predecessor Pius XII of venerated memory, who contributed provident means for the enlargement of the buildings of the Institute and the enhancement of its activity.

All these events have been very well recalled in the beautiful words of your Eminence, so that it is not necessary to repeat things already known. But allow Us to say that the fountain of all this success, the unique and principal fountain is the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Of the goodness and providence of the Sacred Heart the Institute is a solemn monument. Receiving the Superiors, as the work of systematisation was ending, St. Pius X gave them the greatest treasure of all and the pledge of every blessing. He said to them: "I leave you the Sacred Heart," and he attributed to the motto of the shield: *Verbum Domini manet in aeternum* the additional meaning of an enduring and secure protection of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. A hope so wondrously splendid was bound to be fully realised. The years that have passed are the luminous proof of it.

The blessings already received are a promise of new graces in the future. We exhort you, therefore, to take renewed courage from the consideration of past benefits, so that you may go forward with joy, serenity, and assurance in the task undertaken. Surely, as is true of all human works, not everything is done yet, not all difficulties have been surmounted, even new difficulties can arise: but have confidence in Him who protects you: *Ego*

vobiscum sum (Agg. 1,13), says the Lord. He is with you, as you study and peer into the depths of His Word. Forward, then, beloved sons, *in nomine Domini.*

2. This trust in God must give you strength to look to the horizons before you, to the tasks that face your patient labour.

High, indeed, and difficult is the task assigned to the Institute. In the Apostolic Letter *Vinea electa,* which is the *Magna Charta* of the Institute, St. Pius X says with crystalline clearness, "Finis Pontificio Instituto Biblico sit, ut in urbe Roma altiorum studiorum ad Libros sacros pertinentium habeatur centrum, quod efficaciore quo liceat modo, doctrinam biblicam et studia omnia eidem adiuncta, sensu Ecclesiae catholicae, promoveat." Here you have the wide and noble horizon which opens before you. The object of your study is the Sacred Book in all its hidden riches: the teaching, *doctrina,* contained in it. What a splendid programme for your intelligences; and what a cause of joy for the Pope who is speaking to you, for indeed his first solicitude goes to this same purpose.

In the homily spoken on November 10, 1959, *infra Missarum sollemnia,* in Our Cathedral Church, the Lateran Basilica, We set forth the leading lines of Our Pontificate and We said: "Above all We feel the duty to rouse everywhere, and with continuity of action, enthusiasm for every manifestation of the Divine Book, which has been given in order to illuminate the path of life from childhood to old age. Alas! some dark clouds are visible in certain teaching which has little in common with true science. They lie heavy on the horizon at all times, trying to veil the clarity and the splendours of the Gospel. The Book which is open on the altar stands for the task of dispelling such clouds. It stands for the teaching of true doctrine, the right discipline of life, the proper forms of man's uplifting to God."

It is a joy to Us that this holy understanding forms the luminous banner and the high mission of your Institute. The Institute's dedication to the study of the Divine Book corresponds well with the service of that *truth* which We have held up as the first object of Our pontifical government. The Biblical Institute sets in light far and wide the truth that is offered in the sacred scriptures, thus participating in the sublime mission of Jesus the Redeemer: *ad hoc veni in mundum, ut testimonium perhibeam veritati* (Jn. 18:37).

This work in the service of truth includes two things, seriousness, solidity, scientific loyalty of study and teaching and at the same time absolute fidelity to the sacred deposit of Faith and to the infallible Magisterium of the Church.

Scientific seriousness is your first and highest title of honour. It has already gained you very great esteem in the period of years that we are commemorating. The seriousness of scientific work consists, as you know, in using the new means which the progress of science furnishes from day to day. It also consists in courage to face the problems raised by new research and new discoveries. Scientific labour involves fresh examination "of the difficulties still remaining unsolved . . . in an attempt to find a solid explanation" (Pius XII, *Divino afflante Spiritu*).

It is true that this work, moving in a field not yet sufficiently explored, demands great prudence and sobriety. Nothing should be presented as definitive, if perhaps it is nothing more than a working hypothesis. But this does not prohibit the posing of the questions, which are agitating men's minds and are creating difficulty and danger for the faith of many Christians. Under your patient scientific work, using the most modern means of positive studies, there is, therefore, and there ought to be a pastoral intention, an effort to communicate to souls the truth discovered and possessed.

There is no question of neglecting those new branches of knowledge, because scientific seriousness imposes on you the study of them and a thorough acquaintance with them. At the same time it would not be worthy of your task to devote yourselves—in your teaching and research—only to the problems, as we say, of actuality, making light of a great part of that treasure, which is the Word of God and of the age-old labours in the field of interpretation accomplished by the Holy Fathers and the great masters of the Church.

As you see, what We have particularly at heart is the study of those questions that regard sacred doctrine: *doctrinam biblicam . . . promoveat*, as the Letter of Pius X says. Here is the end and purpose of your Institute, which aims at forming not only specialists in matters biblical and profane, but ardent students full of sacerdotal zeal, with the souls of prophets and apostles. In the Encyclical *Divino afflante Spiritu* Pius XII of venerated memory described compendiously this scope of your

studies. This is what we wrote: "ostendant potissimum quae sit singulorum librorum vel textuum theologica doctrina de rebus fidei et morum, ita ut haec eorum explanatio . . . sacerdotibus etiam adiumento sit ad doctrinam christianam coram populo enucleandam, ac fidelibus denique omnibus ad vitam sanctam homineque christiano dignam agendam adserviat." The reason for this is that the Sacred Scripture is not an ordinary or even simply a very high object of study, but God's own revelation. It is a revelation diffused in the pages of the Old and the New Testaments with the feebler light of dawn or with the fulness of mid-day splendour in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World. "When we hear a psalm, a prophecy, or the words of the law . . . all our effort should consist in attention directed to see Christ there." (S. Aug. Enarr. in Ps. 98). From the inspired pages Christ speaks to us to-day and offers substantial spiritual food to our souls.

These profound words of the great Doctor and Bishop of Hippo find wonderful echo in those of another great Doctor and Bishop, the Protopatriarch of Venice, St. Lawrence Giustiniani. This great man's teaching on the pastoral and sanctifying value of the Sacred Scriptures has become familiar to Our spirit, as We took pains to set it forth four years ago in a Pastoral Letter to the clergy and faithful of Venice. These are the accents with which St. Lawrence speaks of the Sacred Book in his work: *De contemptu mundi*: "In order to avoid the snares of human wisdom we have the oracles of the prophets, the writings of the apostles, the vast erudition of the saints. These do not speak to us on their own account, but because Christ is in them . . . Oh, how great the authority of the Divine Scriptures is! What a treasure of truth under the veil of its words—truth that is all holy, all set forth in the adornment of sublime sentences. There is nothing sordid in the Divine Book, nothing oblique, nothing idle, nothing but what deserves veneration. The truth of the Scriptures is splendid in itself; to men it gives high and sapid intelligence; it forms believers, nourishes lovers, directs those who are pilgrims on the earth, infuses joy into those who hope. Indeed, as often as we read the Scriptures, we hear Christ speaking to us, and His gift to us is patience and consolation."

Your work in the Institute is, therefore, an exquisitely sacerdotal work, and should be animated by that zeal which

looks to souls only, to their needs, and to the dangers that threaten them. Your work is done in the consciousness also of the needs and desires of your ex-alumni scattered throughout the world. Your concern is to give them the right orientation, the right directives, and the necessary up-to-date guidance in their life of study and teaching, in view of the generations of young priests that they are forming.

In this light it is easy to understand the importance of the already mentioned basic necessity of *absolute fidelity to the sacred deposit of the Faith and to the Magisterium of the Church.* The Letter of foundation of the Institute entrusts to you the delicate task of promoting sound biblical doctrine "sensu Ecclesiae catholicae." It must be according to the norms already given or to be given by this Apostolic See. If this demand of fidelity to the Church, "pillar and ground of truth" is made of all worthy children of the Church, much more is it incumbent on you, who by express will of the Holy See and by your noble vocation, have allotted to you as the object of your study the high and inscrutable secrets of God contained in the Sacred Book. Seeing the sublime greatness of those realities, the very love of truth, the very desire not to alter truth "by one iota or by one little stroke" make it imperative to maintain full fidelity to the Magisterium of the Church.

The combination of absolute scientific seriousness with full submission to the sacred deposit of the Faith and the teaching of the Ecclesiastical Magisterium requires, in practice, no small modicum of acumen and prudence. On the one hand it is necessary to establish clearly the true meaning and the degree of certainty that belongs to a given scientific conclusion and, on the other hand, the sense and the import of a theological doctrine or of a decision of the Church's Magisterium. Only the full seriousness of learned knowledge and perfect docility to the "sensus Ecclesiae" can secure the proper answer to the various problems, and preserve the studious worker from lamentable errors.

With this hangs a point that We made in our second discourse to the Clergy during the Roman Synod. We said: "The grace of our Lord ensures an intimate satisfaction to good wills nourished and fortified by graceful studies, by knowledge that is drawn not from little rivulets but from robust books, of which even our

age is not devoid. There is need to cultivate humble and courageous emulation of the great publications of the past: Fathers, Writers and Doctors of the Church, for she is always the Mistress of truth in all ages."

St. Peter has left us an admonition in his second letter concerning the special regard one should have in the matter of Biblical studies. His words are: "(Prophetico sermoni) bene facitis attendentes quasi lucernae lucenti in caliginoso loco, donec dies elucescat, et lucifer oriatur in cordibus vestris: hoc primum intelligentes, quod omnis prophetia Scripturae propria interpretatione non fit." (2 Petr. 1, 19-20)

VENERABLE BRETHREN AND DEAR SONS!

Certainly this task is not easy and study alone is not enough. The strengthening light of the Holy Spirit must be invoked. The Spirit, we know, "omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei." Scripture study needs the assistance of His gifts of wisdom and of counsel, of knowledge and of piety. Prayer therefore must be the nourishment and the breath of your studious life, according to St. Augustine's dictum: "Orent ut intelligant. In eis quidem Litteris, quarum studiosi sunt, legunt quoniam 'Diminus dat sapientiam, et a facie eius scientia et intellectus.'" We remind you, then, of the precious gift of St. Pius X: "I leave you the Sacred Heart." In this Heart, meek and humble, one finds the safeguard against all presumption and intellectual vanity. In the Sacred Heart, moreover, are hidden "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

Only thus is full fecundity assured to the mission of the Institute. The Papal Biblical Institute, if it goes forward confidently in this way of humble work, of filial fidelity to the Church, of intense prayer, can be certain that in the future also it will not be left without the divine protection.

This is what We wish you from the bottom of Our heart; this what We ask of the Lord with fervent prayer. And, as a pledge of heavenly gifts, in confirmation also of Our benevolence, We are pleased to impart to you all, who belong to the Biblical Institute—superiors, professors, alumni, ex-alumni, and benefactors—Our Apostolic Benediction as a propitiary blessing to bring you grace and peace from God the Father and from our Lord Jesus Christ.

SUPREME SACRED CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE

DECREE

Concerning the distribution of Holy Communion in the evening.

Can. 867, par. 4 lays down that Holy Communion is not to be distributed outside of the hours within which Mass may be celebrated, *unless some reasonable cause makes it advisable to do otherwise.*

Since, then, by the Constitution "Christus Dominus" of January 6, 1953, together with a mitigation of the displine ruling the Eucharistic fast, the faculty was granted to local Ordinaries to permit, on certain days, the celebration of Mass within afternoon hours (n. vi); it was allowed also, in the Instruction joined to the said Constitution, that the faithful could freely go to Holy Communion *within such an afternoon Mass or immediately before or after it,* provided the conditions of the eucharistic fast laid down in the same Constitution were observed (n. 15).

Subsequently, in an explanation issued on March 22, 1955, it was expressly stated that this concession was made *for the common good of the faithful.* It was, therefore, to be kept within the limits of the common good.

Later still, by the Motu proprio *Sacram Communionem* issued on March 19, 1957, the faculty was given to local Ordinaries to permit the celebration of evening Mass even daily, *if the spiritual good of a notable group of the people required it.*

On comparing these documents with the text of the above canon, the query arose whether the last clause of that paragraph of the canon still remains in force, so that any reasonable cause justifies the petition and distribution of Holy Communion at evening hours, even independently of the celebration of Mass.

To this query, this Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, ordered answer to be given as follows: "Although the said clause is not formally abrogated, it has become applicable more rarely, since with the milder law of eucharistic fast, such a reasonable cause does not occur so easily. However, since such cause cannot be altogether excluded, and evening Masses cannot be celebrated always and everywhere, local Ordinaries can permit the application to these cases of what the Holy See has laid down in the

above-mentioned documents about the distribution of Holy Communion at evening Masses. This means that where Mass is not celebrated the distribution of Holy Communion may be attached to some sacred function, which is determined by the Ordinary as an evening celebration, in churches parochial or non-parochial, or in the oratories of hospitals, prisons and colleges.

By this concession provision is made for the commoon good, and at the same time pastors of souls are protected from frequent petitions from the faithful to give them Holy Communion—petitions which would impede the pastors in the exercise of the duties which the modern needs of the apostolate imposes on them.

This decision of their Eminences, the Cardinals of the Supreme Congregation of the Holy Office, was made at a plenary session on Wednesday, March 16,1960. On the following Friday, March 18, in an audience granted to the Cardinal-Secretary of the Holy Office, our Most Holy Lord, Pope John XXIII, by divine Providence Pope, confirmed the decision of the Eminent Fathers and ordered its publication.

Given at Rome, from the Palace of the Holy Office, March 21, 1960.

SEBASTIAN MASALA, Notary.

PROHIBITION OF BOOKS

By decree of Wednesday, December 16, 1959, confirmed by the Holy Father December 16, and published January 5, 1960, the Holy Office has condemned and placed on the Index of Prohibited Books the anonymous work in 4 volumes, the first of which is entitled: Il Poema di Gesù, the other three: Il Poema dell' Uomo-Dio (published by Tipografia Editrice M. Pisani, Isola del Liri).

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES

Universal Prayer attributed to Pope Clement XI, to be inserted in future editions of the Missal after *En ego* . . . amongst *preces pro opportunitate sacerdotis dicendae.*

I

DECREE URBIS ET ORBIS

(February 24, 1960.)

Credo, Domine, sed credam firmius; spero, sed sperem securius; amo, sed amem ardentius; doleo, sed doleam vehementius.

Adoro te ut primum principium; desidero ut finem ultimum; laudo ut benefactorem perpetuum; invoco ut defensorem propitium.

Tua me sapientia dirige, iustitia contine, clementia solare, potentia protege.

Offero tibi, Domine, cogitanda, ut sint ad te; dicenda, ut sint de te; facienda, ut sint secundum te; ferenda, ut sint propter te.

Volo quidquid vis, volo quia vis, volo quomodo vis, volo quamdiu vis.

Oro, Domine: intellectum illumines, voluntatem inflammes, cor emundes, animam sanctifices.

Defleam praeteritas iniquitates, repellam futuras tentationes, corrigam vitiosas propensiones, excolam idoneas virtutes.

Tribue mihi, bone Deus, amorem tui, odium mei, zelum proximi, contemptum mundi.

Studeam superioribus obedire, inferioribus subvenire, amicis consulere, inimicis parcere.

Vincam voluptatem austeritate, avaritiam largitate, iracundiam lenitate, tepiditatem fervore.

Redde me prudentem in consiliis, constantem in periculis, patientem in adversis, humilem in prosperis.

Fac, Domine, ut sim in oratione attentus, in epulis sobrius, in munere sedulus, in proposito firmus.

Curem habere innocentiam interiorem, modestiam exteriorem, conversationem exemplarem, vitam regularem.

Assidue invigilem naturae domandae, gratiae fovendae, legi servandae, saluti promerendae.

Discam a te quam tenue quod terrenum, quam grande quod divinum, quam breve quod temporaneum, quam durabile quod aeternum.

Da mortem praeveniam, iudicium pertimeam, infernum effugiam, paradisum obtineam.

Per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

NOTE

By decree of the Sacred Penitentiary dated March 11, 1960, priests who devoutly recite the above prayer may gain a partial indulgence of five years, and a plenary once a month if they have recited it daily for an entire month.

II

ROMANA ET ALIARUM DECREE

On the recitation of prayers after the celebration of Mass.

Inquiry was made of this sacred Congregation of Rites by some local Ordinaries, who asked if Decree n. 4305 of June 20, 1913 permitting the omission of the prayers after Mass, when the Mass is celebrated "with some solemnity," may be extended to dialogued Masses celebrated according to the Instruction given by S.C.R. on September 3, 1958 (n. 31).

The Sacred Congregation, having consulted its Liturgical Commission, was pleased to reply: *Affirmative, et ad mentem* (Yes, in the terms hereunder).

The mind of the Sacred Congregation on the matter of the Leonine Prayers is that they may be omitted:

(1) When Mass is celebrated for a wedding, or on the occasion of First Communion, Confirmation, Ordination, or Religious Profession.

(2) When Mass is followed immediately by some function or pious exercise.

(3) When a homily is delivered within Mass.

(4) When Mass is dialogued but, in this case, only on Sundays and Feasts.

(5) Moreover, local Ordinaries can permit that these prayers be said in the vernacular, the text of the translation having been approved by themselves.

The report of the Sacred Congregation's reply was made to the Holy Father by the undersigned Cardinal Prefect, and the rescript was graciously approved and confirmed by His Holiness. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

March 9, 1960.

✠ C. CARD. CICOGNANI, *Prefect.*
Enrico Dante, *Secretary.*

SACRED APOSTOLIC PENITENTIARY

Indulgence for kissing the wedding ring.

In order to foster conjugal love and fidelity, especially at this time when the natural and divine rights of marriage are so often and so disgracefully violated, our Holy Father John

XXIII, by divine Providence Pope, in an audience granted to the undersigned Major Penitentiary on November 21, 1959, benignly decreed that a husband or wife who, on the day of their marriage, singly or together, kiss the the nuptial ring and say with at least a contrite heart and due piety the invocation: "Grant to us, O Lord, that loving Thee we may love one another and live according to Thy holy law" may, by this prayer or a similar one, gain a partial indulgence of three hundred days once, on that day of the celebration of marriage. Everything to the contrary notwithstanding.

Given at Rome, from the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary, November 23, 1959.

N. CARD. CANALI, Major Penitentiary.

J. ROSSI, Regent.

W. LEONARD.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

PARENTS' ROLE IN VOCATIONS, by Godfrey Poage, C.P., and John P. Treacy, Ph.D. (U.S. Bruce. 1959. 132 pp. 2.95 dollars.)

As one reads this intelligent and practical book, one feels that the title is unduly restrictive: it is an excellent manual on the training of children. The authors are convinced that the chief reason for the falling-off in the number of religious vocations is the deterioration of the home training: "Thousands of Catholic boys and girls have no impediment to the religious life. They enjoy abundant health and possess keen intelligences. But their moral training is weak, and they fail to respond to the graces offered."

The authors are experts in the field of vocational guidance and are qualified to give advice to parents on the training of their children. In his studies as well as in his pastoral work Father Poage has thought deeply over the influence exerted by parents on the choice of life made by their children. Dr. Treacy, on his side, has many years of experience at the Marquette University where he is professor of education; he has specialised in preparing teachers in vocational guidance.

Although the authors deal primarily with the fostering of religious vocations, their teaching will be helpful to parents and teachers entrusted with the guidance of youth, for every boy and girl has a vocation to be a good Christian citizen. Actually, vocational guidance is identical with general guidance for happy, successful living, which begins in the ideal Catholic home where the family functions as a well-adjusted, morally sound group of people.

The book is easy to read, the Catholic parents may feel proud enough of its wisdom to pass it on to their non-Catholic friends whose homes may become more peaceful as the bewildered parents struggle with their teenage children. They will learn that training should begin before the teen years, and that discipline is compatible with jollity in a family.

M.O.

Bishop Murray Settles Into Maitland: 1867

Cardinal Moran, in his *History of the Catholic Church in Australasia*, at pages 340-342, gives some brief quotations from letters written to him—"a friend in Ireland"—by James Murray, the first resident Bishop of Maitland.[1] These letters, relating to the Bishop's first months in Australia, throw useful light on the condition of the times, the state of things in Maitland, and the difficulties that faced James Murray as he commenced his episcopate. The extracts given by the Cardinal give only part of the picture as James Murray saw it. It is now the intention to give more of the texts as written by the Bishop. Included amongst them are useful observations on the Bishops' attitude to the Education Act of 1866, the relations between Archbishop Polding and his Suffragans, the Benedictines, and the proposed elevation of Austin Sheehy to the Episcopate. In such instances the correctness of the remarks is left to historical criticism.

As the first letter to be quoted is dated February 19, 1867, it is well to remind readers that Bishops Matthew Quinn and James Murray, accompanied by a large party of nuns and priests, reached Sydney from Ireland on October 21, 1866, after a voyage of 92 days on board the "Empress." After a few days' stay with Dr. John Forrest at St. John's College, Bishop Murray set out for Maitland with Archdeacon McEncroe, and by early December of that year he was already "well in harness."

LETTER 1

East Maitland,
February 19, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,[2]

. . . My affairs have changed for the worse since I last wrote to you, but I suppose it is all for the better. Two priests have left. Let me tell you how we manage the district of Maitland.

There is a Church at West Maitland, one at East Maitland

---

[1]Maitland, limited to the small town of East Maitland, was erected as a Titular See for the coadjutor to the Archbishop of Sydney in 1847. In this capacity Henry Charles Davis, O.S.B., was Bishop of Maitland until 1854. He resided in Sydney.

[2]On January 11, 1867, Dr. Moran had noted: "Rec'd letters from Australia; appointed Vicar-General of Maitland by Right Rev. Dr. Murray." Dr. Moran was then private secretary to Cardinal Cullen, a position Dr. Murray filled in the period 1852-65.

and one at Morpeth, one at Lochinvar, one at Branxton, one in the Paterson district 30 miles off, and a Church at Clarence Town 20 miles off, but the district is distant fully 40 miles. Now how many are we to attend to all these places? Three: Dr. Murray, Father Phelan and Father Michael Doyle.[3] Father Doyle says 9 o'clock Mass in East Maitland and 11 o'clock at Morpeth 4 miles off. Dr. Murray says 8 o'clock Mass at West Maitland and eleven o'clock Mass in same place. Father Phelan goes on one Sunday to Lochinvar and on the other Sunday to Branxton, where the confessions are heard on Sunday morning before Mass. One of these places is distant 7 miles and the other 15 but fortunately there is a railway to it. The Paterson and Clarence Town districts can only be visited on week days. . . . I visited, with Father Phelan, Clarence Town a few days ago and a difficult task it was.

The people of a district called Dungog have a bad name and are said to be very troublesome and they all got word to meet me to see if anything could be done. I must say these poor people were badly treated by Sydney. Some 12 years ago they collected £300 for a new little Church. The Church was never built and of the £300 the sum of £100 was devoted to another Church, a second £100 was applied for a priest, and the third £100 was lent to Morpeth. The people complained of these arrangements. They became reconciled to the application of the first £100 because the Church was in another part of the district. But they were never satisfied about the second £100 for a very good reason because the priest who went there came out to Australia at his own expense and told the people so and the £100 was applied not for the priest, but for the education of a Benedictine Monk in Lyndhurst. The Mission Fund it was called, practically meant nothing else but a Fund to forward the interests of the Benedictines. The secular priests came to Sydney not being adopted by any Bishop and then were taken up by the Archbishop and sent to the districts which contributed £100 for the passage and outfit of a priest. By this plan an immense sum of money got quietly in to the hands of the Benedictines[4] and the poor Dungog people lost their £100.

---

[3]Father Doyle accompanied Dr. Murray from Ireland.

[4]The implication of 'dubious' appropriation of funds would be difficult, if not impossible, to substantiate. C/f. Polding to Gregory, 31/1/1868 (Birt, vol. ii, 334): ". . . the returns for the Missionary Fund these last two years are very poor: I shall not be able to continue the number of All Hallows students. . . ."

Now my object in visiting these poor Irish people was to come to an understanding with them and I went furnished with all the documents connected with Missions, etc. An Ambassador in Rome would not assume half the importance that we did on the occasion referred to. The first great question was about a priest. The priest had left them because they did not support him. . . . I had a list of names and I shewed them that they could well support a priest. They promised they would provide for a priest as soon as he was supplied. The second question was about the Church at Dungog and here they were disposed to murmur. We had to stop them. I said that I came not to hear complaints about the past, but to do something for their future welfare and that I knew nothing and was not responsible for what took place before last November, and with regard to the money that I had in my hands the £100 which was lent to Morpeth and that I would have it ready for them whenever they would erect the Church. I understood also that some persons had about £70 in hands which was raised by Tea parties. I hoped to get some money from a Fund called the Church and School Lands Fund and I would give them a fair share of it together with my own subscription. Lastly I told them that in any case I would not be able to give them a priest for a year probably, and if during that year they would raise £150 which they usually contributed to the priest I would return, the half of it £75 for their new Church and not ask them to pay anything for the passage and other expenses of a priest. They considered this proposal as very fair and on the whole we parted excellent friends. But two or three of the men were wild against Sydney and against the priest who left them and it was not easy to keep them quiet. I am to go up shortly again and they are to let me know if they will carry out my proposition.

I have given you all these details regarding this district in order that you may fully understand our wants which are of a most pressing character. Let me now call your attention to the Singleton district.

Singleton, Muswellbrook, Scone, Murrurundi and two other stations of some importance are all under the charge of one priest, comprising a territory of more than 100 miles in length and I am not able to tell you the width of the district. Singleton district in itself has a very large population and requires the exclusive services of a priest. Murrurundi comes *next* and will require a priest. In that district, as vast as any Diocese, there is

only one priest when, at the very least, there ought to be three, and in a few years there will be ample room for six. Father Leonard visits all these places at stated times and is about for two or three Sundays from Singleton and the people there have no Mass. During his last tour I went up for three Sundays and said Mass for the people at Singleton, but now I cannot even do that owing to our wants in Maitland. I trust you will be able to make out a few priests for me this year and send them to me. Did Propaganda give me any place at all in the College? I asked for one or two places and I trust they granted my request.

. . . Poor Dr. Polding is exposing to ridicule the Propaganda by inducing them to make appointments which are not accepted and indeed they ought to be ashamed of themselves. They promised us most faithfully they would do nothing, and yet they are attempting to make more appointments and committing terrible and fatal blunders, which will not be repaired for half a century. They may fancy they are doing wonders if they get rid of Dr. Polding by yielding to his wishes, but they are greatly mistaken and they are only exhibiting their weakness and their ignorance of the state of Australian affairs and the priests here who understand things are simply laughing at them. Until Dr. Sheehy's appointment[5] it was thought that Rome knew the doings of the Benedictines and disapproved of them, now a complete change in their views has taken place and all the odium of it is thrown on Rome. McDevitt, a brother of Father McDevitt of the University[6] is here on circuit at present and he tells one of our Priests that the conversations of the Laymen in Sydney are frightful against Rome for allowing themselves to be duped by Dr. Polding, whose great mistake and only mistake was his

---

[5]Birt (vol. ii, 328 *seqq.*) goes fairly lengthily into the matter of Father Austin Sheehy's appointment as coadjutor to Archbishop Polding. Writing from Paris on 25/1/1867 to Archdeacon McEncroe, Roger Therry, who had recently seen Dr. Polding, observed: "Some of the recent episcopal appointments have greatly surprised me. One like myself who has been so long absent from the Colony has perhaps no right to give an opinion in such matters; but I cannot help saying that Mr. Sheehy must have risen greatly in estimation for talents and general ability to fit him for the office. . . . The question arises too plainly on the surface—had he not been a Benedictine would he have been chosen for the office? . . ." On 20/1/1867, Therry had likewise written to Father Patrick Bermingham (in Ireland): ". . . When I left Sydney" (1859) "he was very young—had given no proof of talents, and his theological education must have been very slight. He was, I believe, never out of the Colony and I am not aware that there was what could be regarded as a regular course of divinity taught in Sydney while I was there. . . ."

[6]that is, of the Catholic University of Ireland.

predilection for the Benedictines who proved such ungrateful and unworthy children. . . .

Father S— is on his way to Ireland after giving a deal of trouble and some scandal. . . . I have been abused in unmeasured terms in Sydney for my conduct towards S—, but that troubles me very little.

I hope you will be able to find one or two priests at least to accompany the Nuns and the sooner they all come the better. . . .

† JAMES MURRAY."

LETTER 2

East Maitland,
July 22, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,

. . . I was delighted to learn that the Nuns and priests would start for certain, and we will be expecting them about the end of August. If Father Garvan comes I will try and make him quite strong so that he may be able to give us a retreat and some missions to the people.

I wrote to you and to the Cardinal by the last Mail, but the letters could not reach Sydney in time as all communication was interrupted. The public roads were impassable and the railway carried off in various points by the fearful floods. This (the Hunter) district has suffered very much. I suppose £40,000 would not compensate for property, crops, etc., that were completely lost. The Government sent up assistance immediately and the people of Sydney and other places made great collections in behalf of all the districts that suffered. I must say the practical sympathy shown on all sides and by all classes has made a favourable impression on my mind. We have formed Committees in the various districts, and we all, Catholics, Protestants and Presbyterians, work together most cordially for the benefit of the sufferers. . . . If we be visited frequently by these floods Maitland cannot expect to prosper. The whole place was covered with water and some houses swept away. The Cathedral was surrounded by water but fortunately it did not enter the Church. We could not have any Mass there on one Sunday. The House intended for the Nuns escaped well, but the ground attached to it was all covered. It seems this last flood was the greatest ever witnessed in the district. Until then the flood of 1857 was spoken of as the highest, but the flood of 1867 has surpassed it.

I had arranged to make an appeal to the people and to have a general collection on the last Sunday of July to pay off half the debt on the house for the Nuns and, of course, we must defer it for six or ten months. Perhaps it is just as well that the Nuns should be settled down first and the people know something about them.

The late flood also will give rise to another consideration. All the ground near the Church was covered with water and we apprehend it will not be safe to build a house for the priests on it. Some day or other, house, Church and all may be swept away. Unfortunately the river is gradually encroaching on the land . . . and unless a very strong barrier be erected . . . it seems scarcely safe to build. The question of erecting such a barrier is now mooted, but I fear nothing will be done. . . .

I was very glad to learn that you had one student for me in the Propaganda, and that he was giving satisfaction to the Superiors. I know Joseph O'Carroll quite well and I trust his health will be improved by the voyage. I would be very glad that all my students went to Rome for some time but I fear the Propaganda could not receive them, and I don't see how we could encourage the matter otherwise than by asking the Propaganda to take charge of them. . . .

. . . I may say I have done nothing as yet except to say Mass and hear confessions and this is the best thing I can do until we get assistance. When the priests come I purpose going through a good part of the Diocese and seeing how matters stand.

As my budget of news about Maitland is gloomy enough this time owing to the floods, I may as well give some good news. The ground attached to the Convent was very small. There was a small plot close to it and a Mr. Mitchell has made a present of it. This Mr. Mitchell is from Roundwood, Co. Wicklow, and the purchase of it would not be less than £300. There was another plot belonging to Dean Lynch who had charge of this mission for many years. He is now in Armidale. He has made us a present of his plot value I suppose for £200 or £300. So you already see we are making some progress.

Since writing the above I have had a letter from Dr. James Quinn about the house at Gayfield. I have written to him to say that I am not at all in a position to take any part in the prospect of establishing an Australian College. The times are very depressed here and I have to pay £2000 for the Convent. . . . All admit that the Colony of New South Wales was never in

such a depressed condition as it is at present, and we must conform to the times and have a little patience. Besides the population is not increasing so rapidly here and I am not certain what number of priests I may require. Probably eight or ten besides those I have would be quite sufficient for some years to come. This place is not advancing like America and it is evident that this circumstance should be kept in view. . . .

† JAMES MURRAY."

LETTER 3

East Maitland,
August 20th, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,

Many thanks for the kind letter which you wrote in Paris on your way to the eternal city. Will you kindly say to His Eminence that I also received his most welcome letter which was enclosed. . . . I hope (the Nuns) will have a prosperous and safe voyage, and that Fathers Stone and O'Carroll will be quite strong and well on their arrival. . . . Father Phelan who is here is a very good priest and I intend placing the Nuns under his guidance. . . .

The education bill passed last year,[7] about which I wrote to you, will do terrible mischief. In the whole Colony of New South Wales there will not be a Catholic school in a short time. We may be able to keep on a few in large towns and even do that much with great difficulty and the Public or mixed schools will destroy the rising generation and I cannot see what we can do to prevent such a terrible evil. A great number of the Church of England people opposed the new Bill, but now they seem to avail themselves of its advantages, and so well they may for the books and teachers and everything connected with the Public schools will be Protestant and it will be impossible to keep the Catholic children from these schools as there will be no Catholic school, and no means of erecting one owing to the small number of Catholics and their slender means. The Council of Education withdrew Dr. Whately's Scripture Lessons from the Catholic schools, but not from the Public schools, in which they will be explained to all the children by Protestant, Presbyterian and Wesleyan teachers. It is a sad state of things.

---

[7]The Public Schools Act of 1866.

We (the Bishops) met the Archbishop on his arrival at Sydney[8] and spoke to him on the matter, but he was so much engaged and not having studied the bill he was not in a position to come to any decision. We are to meet in a few days again and may God direct us to do what is right. After our meeting I will write to Cardinal Cullen and let him know our position with respect to education in this Colony.

Father Austin Sheehy will not, it is rumoured, accept the Mitre. I had a letter from him a few days ago . . . and in the end of it he says, 'Allow me to mention, My Lord, that I remain in my old position as the Archbishop's Vicar-General and am not entitled to any other title than belongs to that office. I hope all question of the Episcopate is finally settled.' The Archbishop may yet induce him to accept, but probably whatever letter Cardinal Barnabo wrote has brought about this change. We will know more about it in a few days.

The people of Sydney gave the Archbishop a grand reception on his return. He was in great spirits and in excellent health after a very long and boisterous voyage. We thought it well to meet him and to welcome him home. The present Government is very hostile to Catholics and it is of the utmost importance that the Bishops should be of one mind and if we are not united our enemies will take advantage of our differences and do a deal of mischief.

† JAMES MURRAY."

LETTER 4

East Maitland,
September 20th, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,

I hasten to announce to you the arrival of the good Dominican Nuns and Revd. Messrs. Stone and O'Carroll. They reached Sydney in 80 days and had a most agreeable voyage. . . . The Nuns were remarkably strong and healthy on their arrival and caused quite a sensation both in Sydney and Maitland . . . on the whole I think a more efficient community of Nuns never came to Australia, or to use Dr. McEncroe's expression, he never saw a finer batch of Nuns landing in Australia.

[8]Archbishop Polding arrived back in Sydney from Europe on August 7. Bishops James and Matthew Quinn, Murray and Lanigan were present to greet him.

I went to Sydney to meet them; . . . on their arrival (in Maitland) on the 10th of September we had a *Te Deum* and Benediction . . . and afterwards they were conducted to their new house, with which they seem to be well pleased. . . . No doubt everything in a new country like this will appear very strange to the Sisters for a while. They have already taken charge of St. John's schools in which the attendance has considerably increased and in a few days they will open a day school for respectable children. . . . The presence of the Nuns in the school and their example will do much towards removing the evils arising from the new (education) bill while the instruction which they will impart . . . will be of a high order although they will be obliged to use during the hours of secular instruction the books of the Irish National Board. It is impossible to say what steps will be taken by the Catholics in reference to this bill on education, but it is very easy to see that whether we brush with the Council of Education or not it will be quite out of our power to provide Catholic schools in the thinly populated districts. . . . If something is not done to change the bill and render it less injurious to Catholic interests fearful mischief will be done in a few years and we shall have a new generation without faith and religion.

I am sorry to say poor Father O'Carroll is not improved by the voyage. He is even worse than when he left Ireland and I fear he will not be of any use to us here. . . . Unfortunately I am not strong myself and I was hoping that the two priests on their arrival would be ready for work. Father Stone appears to be quite well. . . . There is not the least use in sending any delicate priest to this climate. All the priests without exception have to work very hard on Sundays and to fast to a late hour and when they visit other districts on week-days they never can say Mass before eleven o'clock. . . . I beg of you to pay special attention to this point in selecting priests for this mission. I am in great want of a few priests and the people will be greatly disappointed now when they hear of one of those lately arrived being so delicate. I am well aware that you are doing all you can for me and I hope a good Providence will send you three or four efficient priests for this diocese. Everyone is saying what a pity the priests are not as strong as the Nuns. . . .

†JAMES MURRAY."

LETTER 5

East Maitland.
October 11, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,

As I am leaving this evening and will be about probably for five or six weeks visiting several parts of the diocese I must write you a few lines. . . .

You will be glad to hear that the Nuns are all quite well and at work. They have in St. John's schools nearly 140 children and I expect they will have 30 more in a short time. They have in their pension school 16 children and I have no doubt but that they will very soon have between 30 and 40 children in attendance. They are ready to receive a few boarders also, but the number must be very small as they have no room for them. They will be able to receive about six or eight boarders at present. . . .

Father Stone is strong and well. I have placed him with Father Phelan in West Maitland. He seems to be working very hard. Father O'Carroll is under the care of the Doctor still. . . . His illness is a great drawback and a great disappointment to the people. . . . I hope you will be able to send us two or three priests very soon from All Hallows or Carlow as our wants are very great indeed. But they should be strong, active men and able to ride and bear the heat which is intense at times.

I wrote to the Society for the Propagation of the Faith explaining the wants and difficulties of the Mission. I hope they will give a large sum to this diocese. . . . Things are in a very depressed state here just now and the people are only trying to live, and they have a hard struggle.

As I anticipated Dr. Sheehy's affair is not over yet. On the 24th of last month there was a meeting of the Clergy of Sydney held. It had been convened for the purpose of treating of the education question. But advantage was taken of the occasion and the priests induced to sign a document in favour of Dr. Sheehy. This document was addressed to the Propaganda. Archdeacon McEncroe was asked to take the chair, he declined and left the room. He was indignant that the clergy should be asked to interfere with regard to Dr. Sheehy's affair without the least previous notice. Two or three other priests did not sign the document, but of course the priests present did sign. They had been so cleverly dragged into the business without any

notice. In the document addressed to the Propaganda the charges against Dr. Sheehy are not mentioned and the priests who signed it really did not know what they were. From this you clearly see what value is to be attached to the document in question. They ask Propaganda not to accept the resignation of Dr. Sheehy without knowing or examining the nature of the accusations. The whole affair is a most shameful proceeding and was done in two hours. The Mail was leaving Sydney at two o'clock on that day (24th September) for Europe. An Italian priest, Father Barsanti, went by that Mail to plead the cause of Dr. Sheehy in Rome. I received some letters from priests of the Sydney Diocese and I wrote a few lines to Cardinal Barnabo and to Monsignor Kirby by the Panama Mail which left for Europe on the first of this month. The substance of my letters is simply this that as charges of a serious nature were preferred against Dr. Sheehy they ought to be investigated and that the document signed by the priests of Sydney was not deserving of attention as neither an investigation was held, nor an opportunity offered of enquiring whether they were founded in fact or not.[9]

† JAMES MURRAY"

LETTER 6

East Maitland.
December 21st, 1867.

"My dear Dr. Moran,

. . . . I forgot to thank you for all the fine books you sent me. They are nearly all gone. . . . Thank the Cardinal, too, for the Altar Stones for which I am so much obliged. Indeed I feel his great kindness to me very much and a line from him cheers me very much in this distant country.

I am glad you settled the All Hallows' bill. It is high, but God is good and I hope the Propagation of the Faith will stand to me this year. . . . When things come down on a poor man at one and the same time he finds it hard to get on. I wrote

[9]For a rather different comment, cf. Polding to Gregory, 23/10/1867 (Birt, vol. ii, 331): ". . . The clergy were so indignant at this charge against Father Austin that almost in a body (McEncroe and Dillon keeping aloof), they petitioned me to permit Father Bazanti" (Barsanti) "to go to Rome with a 'supplica' on their part, that the Consecration might be proceeded with. They also met with denial the assertion . . . that the report of his elevation . . . had by reason of his bad name been a cause for scandal. . . ."

to the Propagation of the Faith last October and explained everything to them as best I could. I must say they have been most generous to me or rather to the Diocese. . . .

Poor O'Carroll is not getting on, I fear he is losing ground. . . . Father Phelan got a fall from his horse or rather with his horse. His collar bone is . . . dislocated. . . . This is an awful country for accidents and that is the reason I selected my motto *Deum Time.* Father Phelan is a most careful man and still he did not escape, and he is a most intelligent priest but *inter nos rather too timid.* This of course is private, you are my Vicar General and I can tell you everything.

I am very much obliged to you for your kind hint about Dr. James Quinn. He nor no other Bishop was deputed to be our spokesman. We all agreed to write our views separately. I did so on the 22nd of June and I stated that the nuns in Goulburn were doing wonders and that it was all due to the zeal of Father McAlroy. I said that in six years he built a Convent and several Churches and expended for religion £25,000. The people gave the money because they saw he was disinterested.[10] . . And I will add that if I wanted a spokesman, Dr. James Quinn most certainly would not be the person I should depute. I would not say so much only that you are my Vicar General.

I have also to thank you for your suggestion about writing frequently to Propaganda. I have done so repeatedly; I have made Dr. Mat Quinn do the same. The fact is I have written so much and so often that I was ashamed, being a young Bishop,[11] and I apologised for the great liberty I had taken in writing upon so many subjects. Dr. Mat and I wrote about the system of appointing Bishops and we both and Dr. James Quinn, too, got an assurance from the Propaganda that the American rule will be followed. I write upon the same subject by this Mail and I shall inform the Cardinal Prefect that Dr. Polding stated to us a few weeks ago that the proposed rule could not be observed in Australia, and was not observed in America. We said nothing as we did not want to discuss such a question which had been settled by the Propaganda. In my humble opinion no other system ought to be adopted and if any other method be pursued we will have ignorant and drunken priests appointed bishops. We were extremely anxious to come to an understanding on

[10]There was a question of dividing the Goulburn diocese. Many had thought Father McAlroy would have been appointed to Goulburn.
[11]Born in 1828, Dr. Murray was then 39 years of age.

the education question and we succeeded. The pastoral letter which I send you is the result of what I looked upon as settled between us.

Dr. Polding told us that Dr. Goold would return immediately and that the Provincial Synod would be held immediately after Easter. I think he will not hold it until Dr. Goold shall return so God only knows when the Synod will take place[12]. . . We were afraid the Archbishop would not take a proper stand on his arrival,[13] but he did, and you will observe that I almost go too far in praising him. We have him committed to the right view, although he never recognised our statement forwarded to the Colonial Secretary last June, which I give in my letter and which the Cardinal Archbishop of Dublin says, is very good. After all I only say that the Archbishop has done more for Australia and for New South Wales than will ever be done by the vagabonds who constitute the Council of Education. Then there is a line about mixed marriages and I might just as well have stabbed the old man with a dagger. If reflects so much on his views, on his policy, and on the practice of his priests. Some of my priests notwithstanding my letter of last February continued to assist at mixed marriages as usual, and I have put an end to it in a very simple way. I made them give me returns of all marriages from 1st November, 1866, the day on which I took possession, to 1st November, 1867. One priest, Father Leonard, a good priest and a zealous priest, performed seven mixed marriages. I have forbidden him to do the like again, and I think he and I will not agree and as he has wonderful influence over Father Phelan, the latter may retire too[14]. . . . Leonard and Phelan are both from Carlow and good men, but Phelan is by far the best and more intelligent. I will not drive things to extremes but I will not allow mixed marriages indiscriminately.

I hope the Propaganda will never consent to Father Austin Sheehy's promotion, but probably I will say more on this subject by next mail.

† JAMES MURRAY."

R. A. DALY.

St. John's College, University of Sydney,
Camperdown.

---

[12]The Second Provincial Synod was held in Melbourne in April, 1869
[13]that is, a proper stand on the education question.
[14]both priests subsequently returned to Sydney diocese.

Sharing Our Faith Through The Catholic Enquiry Centre

Coupon advertising is a modern craze. In the daily newspapers in Australia it is almost as popular in recent years as the boomerang before the advent of Captain Cook. The coupon is like the boomerang too: it comes back.

If we have anything to sell, from the insurance policy to the latest detergent, we advertise it as the best on the market bar none, we round off the advertisement with a coupon which is to be posted for a "free sample," and we wait confidently for the coupons to come back.

It may sound a little unusual to use this technique as a means of sharing our Faith with others, but it has one point to recommend it: it works.

A HUMBLE BEGINNING

In July, 1959, I placed a six-inch double column advertisement with a coupon in the Sydney *Sun-Herald.* Set against a background of a priest offering the Holy Mass, it said: "The Mass is the Centre of the Catholic Faith. If you would like to know more about it or about any other point of Catholic teaching the Catholic Enquiry Centre will gladly send you a course of lessons. Post this coupon to-day for a FREE explanatory leaflet and sample lesson."

The Catholic Enquiry Centre at that stage was a small rented house in the Sydney suburb of Maroubra. I had a number of sets of twenty-one simple lessons on the teachings of the Catholic Church, a box number at the local post office, one permanent typist and a few voluntary helpers.

Within a week I had 450 signed coupons on my desk. To each applicant I sent a short personal letter, an explanatory leaflet and, of course, the "free sample," i.e., any one lesson from the set of twenty-one. Each applicant was invited to write again if further interested, and to enrol for the full course of lessons which would be sent free and in confidence at the rate of one lesson each week.

THE VERDICT OF THE ENQUIRERS

By the end of August 380 non-Catholics had enrolled for the

lessons and were receiving them week by week. With every fifth lesson I sent them a short questionnaire. It had a twofold purpose; to get some idea of how much they had absorbed, and to encourage them to re-read the lessons. I invited them to ask for further explanation of any points they still found difficult to follow. The questionnaires were well answered. The questions were good and indeed very much more numerous than I had anticipated. The letters of thanks and appreciation assured me that the experiment was worthwhile.

Here is a typical example. A Victorian doctor said, "The five lessons I have received so far have helped me very much. They have given me a much better understanding of religion and have brought me nearer to God."

A Queensland housewife wrote on another occasion to say, "The lessons are most interesting and helpful, so much so that each week I look forward to the next lesson. . . . I realise how empty my life has been up till now."

There were letters from people in every walk of life, from professional men and process workers, from public servants and hospital patients, from returned soldiers and mothers of families. Seven letters the same morning concluded by saying, "Thank you, and may God bless you and your helpers for all you are doing."

MORE COUPONS

Later that year there were a few more advertisements and coupons, and a lot more questions. Within six months I had received just on 3000 requests for the brochure and free sample. One thousand four hundred and fifty non-Catholics were following the course. I knew then that the test period was over, the experiment was a success, the Catholic Enquiry Centre had come to stay.

I have no misgivings about its future. There are thousands of good people all around us searching for God . . . looking for a faith. They are too shy to come openly to one or other of the many discussion groups or instruction centres where the teachings of the Church are explained, but, like Nicodemus, who came secretly in the night for fear of the Jews, they are ready and willing to avail themselves of the secrecy of a confidential course of lessons.

THE QUESTION OF THE YEAR

A Victorian farmer wrote me in September to say,

"Everyone in my house is a Catholic except myself; even the cat gets fish on Fridays. I know a lot about the Catholic Church but there is one thing that intrigues me about your Enquiry Centre. What do you use for money?"

I sent him a brochure on our Sponsors Scheme.

We have nearly 2000 Sponsors. They are the real power behind the work of the Catholic Enquiry Centre. Spiritually as well as financially we depend completely on them. Each one has organised a little group of Catholic friends (approximately twelve) who help us with prayers and finance.

A Sponsor explains our work to a group of friends, gives them a copy of our special prayer for conversions and collects 2/- per month from each one for our work. I offer Mass for them all on the First Sunday of each month, and keep them up to date on progress through a regular newsletter. I am hoping to find an additional 3000 Sponsors during the next 12 months. That will make it possible to enlarge and expand the work of the Centre until our advertisements are seen regularly in the main papers in every State in Australia.

We are now sending a carefully prepared lesson on some point of Catholic teaching into 1500 non-Catholic homes every week. It may well be 5000 per week by the end of this year.

PARTICIPATION BEGETS INTEREST

Our Sponsor Scheme gives Catholics unique opportunities to share their Faith with others. Through the newsletters I encourage them to tell their non-Catholic friends about this free course which the Centre offers. I send them enrolment forms for the course and ask them to keep one on hand for any non-Catholic who shows an interest in the Faith. They have recruited 650 starters in six months.

When people are given a practical way of sharing in the work of the Church they become vitally interested in it. They can scarcely be interested in anything unless they are given some measure of participation. It is comparatively easy for us priests to talk about Catholic Action, or to tell people that they should be lay apostles, but it seems to me that the real crux of the matter is to give them ways and means of doing something apostolic. The Sponsor Scheme brings the primary apostolate of the Church within reach of everyone.

SCHOOL SPONSORS

In response to many requests I have now started a special section of the Sponsor Scheme for schools.

I spoke some months ago to a class of 13-year-old boys in a Catholic school. I asked the boys one by one, "How many non-Catholics do you think there are in your parish?" Some said one hundred, others three or four hundred. The highest figure I got was five hundred. The parishes in question each had from 10,000 to 20,000 non-Catholics. Here is a clear indication that our boys, and no doubt our girls too, are quite unconscious of the vast field for apostolic action that awaits them down their own street, or around the next corner. Perhaps we have been too preoccupied helping them to keep the faith. We have allowed them to keep it to themselves.

Through this scheme I have asked every boy and girl to help towards the "building up of the Body of Christ" here in Australia. May I say again, *participation is the secret of interest.* The more opportunities they are given to participate the greater will their interest be.

A number of head teachers have already contacted me and have got the scheme started in their schools. Judging from a few progress reports which have just come to hand I am confident that great things will be achieved.

LET'S TO THE TASK

Young and not so young, there are just over two million of us Catholics in Australia. The conversion of our country is a challenge to us all. It will require great faith and courage and generosity to set ourselves seriously to the task of converting eight million souls. The road will be long and the turnings many, but the challenge is ours to face. "A journey of a thousand leagues begins with a single step."

THOMAS A. WHITE.

Catholic Enquiry Centre, Maroubra, Sydney, N.S.W.

Moral Theology

MIXED MARRIAGES AND THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN —OBLIGATION TO AVOID DANGER OF CONTRACTING MIXED MARRIAGE—MARRIAGE OF LAX CATHOLICS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

1. With regard to the moral certainty required that the children of a mixed marriage will be educated as catholics, does the law mean that moral certainty is needed not only that the children will be taught their faith, but that they will practise it? If so, may a dispensation be granted when the catholic party has partially or totally lapsed from the practice of the faith and, despite instruction and persuasion, it appears will not give the example necessary if the children are to remain practising catholics?

2. Is it a sound view that those who go out regularly with non-catholics are bound in conscience, before the association becomes serious, to put their case to a priest for his judgment on whether there are sufficient grounds in the particular case for a continuation of the friendship? If so, should absolution be denied to a person who refuses to follow the judgment of a confessor in this matter?

3. What is to be said about marriages between catholics who no longer practise the faith? Is there any prohibition of these marriages by the natural law, if despite the efforts on the part of the priest, it is foreseen that the children will be taught little or nothing about their faith, or, if they are taught, there will be small likelihood that they will practise it?

INTERESTED.

REPLY.

1. The ecclesiastical Superior who grants a dispensation for a mixed marriage must have moral certainty that the children of the union will be baptized and educated as catholics. (can. 1861, par. 1, n.3.) Their catholic education means that they should receive an intellectual and moral training during the years of formation which will enable them on maturity to live up to the

obligations consequent on membership of the Catholic Church. From an early age they should be instructed, according to their capacity, in the knowledge of their religion. If instruction is to be effective, they should also be taught to practise the faith, especially by those acts of the virtue of religion which include some daily prayers and, where possible, regular attendance at Mass and, later, frequent reception of the Sacraments. How this practical instruction is to be given will depend on circumstances, but it is self-evident that the best training is the good example of parents and older members of the family. Parental carelessness, however, is not an insuperable obstacle to the future exemplary lives of the children, as is shown by the fact that excellent men and women have come from homes where the faith languished. The influence of a good school, the care of catholic relatives and friends, the active interest of catholic Associations, such as the Legion of Mary, etc. and, above all, the solicitude of the pastor can all help to supply for the negligence of father and mother. To exclude the possibility of catholic up-bringing for no other reason than parental carelessness is to reach a conclusion which does not necessarily follow. If the Ordinary who is entrusted with the responsibility of granting or refusing the dispensation judges that, everything considered, the children will not be exposed to grave danger of losing the faith, and have a good hope of being catholics, with the minimum of training required to lead catholic lives, he may grant the dispensation.

Our correspondent's question could be possibly intended to ask if moral certainty is required that the children of a mixed marriage will remain practising catholics in adult age. Moral certainty is a term which must be understood in its context. It does not exclude the possibility of its opposite, but would mean a well-founded hope, based on the evidence available, and making due allowance in spiritual matters for the beneficial workings of divine grace. When the object of our moral certainty is the conduct and future religious practice of the members of a family yet unborn, one may wonder how any certainty, except in the widest sense of the term, can be arrived at. All that can be prudently foreseen at the present is that suitable measures will be taken to train the young in the hope that they will be good catholics.

The Church is solicitous about mixed marriages for many

reasons, the chief of them being the risk of loss of the true faith.[1] This is the greatest loss that could be sustained by a catholic, and the whole spiritual structure falls with it. Canons 1060 and 1061 of the Code expressly mention danger of perversion (*periculum perversionis*) as the reason why a mixed marriage may be forbidden by the divine law. This danger has to be countered by efficacious measures, before the Church will grant a dispensation to allow the marriage.

Danger is a risk of evil. It is impossible to exclude all danger of sin as long as we remain in this world: and some risks are present for any marriage, that it may not result in the spiritual good of the parties or the offspring. Measures must be taken to reduce them to the extent that a prudent man will not hesitate to undertake the dangers with a hope of success. A realisation of the difficulties does not exclude moral certainty of the ultimate success of the marriage, though the possibility of failure be frankly acknowledged.

The danger which the Church seeks to minimise above all, when there is question of a mixed marriage, is the danger of perversion. The other dangers of various grades associated with them—*Communicatio in sacris cum hereticis,* domestic strife etc. —may not be permitted except for sufficient reason; but serious and proximate danger of perversion would not be justified. Perversion, we must note, is something more than carelessness in the practice of the faith: it is the positive turning way from it, either partially by heresy or totally by apostasy. The Church exhorts her children to fulfil their religious duties, she even commands attention to some of them under pain of serious sin, in her desire that all should be true to their Christian vocation. She is also anxious to shield the faithful from all other dangers linked with mixed marriages. They are indeed serious matters, but not so fundamental as holding to the true faith. The risk of careless children from a mixed marriage increases when

---

[1]"We should beware lest the faithful seek to enter marriage with those who are separated from us and do not share with us the title of Catholics. We can scarcely hope that souls divided on the matter of religion will be in accord on other matters. It is easily seen why such marriages should be avoided: they give occasion to have share and part in sacred rites which are forbidden, they create a danger for the religion of the catholic partner, are an obstacle to the proper instruction of the children and frequently lead to the acceptance of the theory that all religions are equal, with no reference to truth or falsehood." Pope Leo XIII. Encyclical Letter *Arcanum.* 10th February, 1880.

the catholic party is negligent; but even this risk may be taken with less hesitation and for less reason than danger of total loss of the faith. For one who has the true faith, a full Christian life is not beyond the bounds of possibility; and the neglect or practice of religion depends on whether the individual corresponds with the graces given with the gift of faith. Without faith, it is impossible for a person to be saved by the ordinary means instituted by Christ. It is true that the catholic who does not practise his religion cannot expect salvation any more than the non-catholic—in one sense, he is in a worse condition, as he sins against his better knowledge—but repentance is always possible for him. He knows where to turn for spiritual help, when he realises his plight; and he can regain the friendship of God by the proper use of the Sacrament of Penance. If marriage were made impossible for catholics, unless it were absolutely certain that their children would eventually be regular, without fail, at Sunday Mass and their Easter Communion (to mention but two of the common duties of practical catholics) how many marriages would have to be forbidden? By too strict a standard, the natural right of man to marry and have children could be unreasonably restricted.

It would seem, then, that a mixed marriage must not be allowed for any cause, when there is a serious and evident danger of loss of faith. For sufficient reasons, we may permit a mixed marriage, notwithstanding the other dangers associated with it. The canonical causes for the dispensation will usually be sufficient reason to justify these risks.[2]

As most priests have to deal with mixed marriages in the course of their pastoral work, a brief summary of the conditions under which they may be permitted will not be entirely useless repetition. It is the Ordinary, by virtue of Faculties granted by the Holy See, who gives the dispensation, and he is the person who is to judge whether the conditions are fulfilled. Nevertheless, he will have to depend frequently on information supplied by the pastor to decide whether he should dispense or not. In the hope of offering some help to priests who have to make

---

[2]Si perversionis periculum in casu particulari reipsa non solum non cessaret, sed etiam proximum esset, contrahentes contra legem naturae graviter peccarent.

Quamvis omne periculum animae in parte catholica et in prole vix unquam penitus sit exclusum, ex causa tamen sufficienter gravi remotum aliquod periculum licite permittitur. (Noldin. Theologia Moralis, Ed XXX., vol. III., n. 560,a.,b.

application for the dispensations, the following observations are submitted.

A mixed marriage, understood strictly, is between a catholic and a baptised member of an heretical, schismatical or atheistic sect. (can. 1060, Code Com. 30 July 1934, A.A.S. 26-494) The impediment of mixed religion is not diriment; and the marriage would be valid, if contracted in the proper form, even if no dispensation were sought or obtained. There is another impediment—disparity of worship (*disparitas cultus*)—between a catholic and a non-catholic, who has not received valid baptism. This is a diriment impediment and forbids the marriage under pain of invalidity. (can. 1070) Whether the impediment be mixed religion or disparity of worship, we commonly refer to a marriage forbidden by either of them as a 'mixed marriage.' Both are prohibited by the positive law of the Church in canons 1060 and 1070 respectively, in the presumption of *periculum commune*. But a marriage between a catholic and a non-catholic may be also contrary to the divine law; and it certainly is so, if there be a serious danger to the faith of the catholic party or of the children of the marriage. When there is no such danger, because it has been duly provided for and steps taken to counter it, the prohibition of the divine law ceases, *cessante fine*. The marriage, however, still remains contrary to the ecclesiastical law, unless a dispensation be first obtained. The Church is rightly unwilling to relax her own law in favour of one who proposes to use the dispensation gravely to transgress the ordinances of God, by whose authority the Church is constituted the teacher and custodian of morality.

To ensure the observance of the law of God, in so far as it is possible for her to control the actions of her subjects, the Church has enacted certain conditions which are to be observed before a dispensation will be granted for a mixed marriage. These conditions are:

1. Just and grave reasons for the marriage;

2. The non-catholic must guarantee to remove all danger of perversion from the catholic; and both parties must guarantee that all the children to be born of the union will be baptised and educated in the catholic faith and in no other;

3. There must be moral certainty that the guarantees will be fulfilled. (can. 1061, par.1., n. 1,2,3.)

1. The first condition is that there must be just and grave reasons for the dispensation. This is an application of the general principle of law that a dispensation will not be given, unless for a just cause, which is serious in proportion to the gravity of the law from which the dispensation is requested. Matrimonial impediments safeguard the sanctity of marriage; and the two impediments under consideration have special reference to the preservation of the faith for the next generation. They are thus not lightly to be dispensed. Furthermore, there are other elements of danger associated with a mixed marriage, which cannot be altogether overcome; and a sufficient reason is always required to justify a danger of transgressing the moral law. Since the dispensation cannot be given without at least one valid cause, the pastor should not omit to mention the causes when he applies for the dispensation. A reason, which compensates for the risk to the faith and the other dangers involved in a mixed marriage, will be more readily considered than another reason having no reference to precise evils the Church desires to prevent when she forbids catholics to marry those not of the faith. Thus, the good dispositions of the non-catholic, which give ground for hope of conversion, would be more applicable than *aetas superdulta mulieris.* The canonical causes usually listed in the text books also have due weight with regard to these two impediments.[3]

2. The second condition required for a dispensation allowing a mixed marriage is that the guarantees be given. The purpose of the guarantees is to provide the Superior who is asked for the dispensation with sufficient evidence that there is no danger to the faith of the catholic party or of the children, or at least no danger so great that it would be rash to allow his subjects to be exposed to it. As a rule, the guarantees are to be in writing, as this is the most efficacious means of establishing the fact that they have been given. (Cf. can. 1061, par 2.) Unless the guarantees are given, at least implicitly and in such a way as to be capable proof in the external form, the dispensation is invalid. (Holy Office. 10th May 1941. A.A.S. 33-294,5.) A dispensation from a public impediment is an act of jurisdiction in the external forum and proof of it is required. A person who was actually disposed to agree to the guarantees and carry them out, but

[3]A Note on the canonical causes which may occur will be found at the end of this section.

gave no sign by word or deed directly or indirectly that such was his mentality, would not benefit by the dispensation. A man's intentions remain in his own exclusive knowledge unless he expresses them in some manner. Titius, who gives the promises in writing or by word of mouth before witnesses, has acted explicitly. Caius, who asks for instructions with a view to being received into the Church may be reasonably supposed to have the intention of placing no obstacle to the faith of his wife and children. Since he wishes to embraee the true faith, he will observe all the laws of the Church with regard to the obligations of a husband and a father.

There are two guarantees or promises. The first is given by the non-catholic party to the effect that he (or she) will not be a danger to the faith of the catholic or of the children. The second is given by both parties: that all the children will be baptised and educated as catholics.

i. The first guarantee means that no obstacle will be placed by the non-catholic to the fulfilment of religious duties by the catholic husband or wife, and consequently that every opportunity will be afforded for the observance of catholic practices both in domestic and in public life. Much less may any inducements be made to entice the catholic to become a member of some sect, attend non-Catholic worship, or abandon religion altogether. In a word, full liberty must be promised that the catholic spouse will not be disturbed with regard to the faith and will be able to do all that is required of a conscientious catholic.

ii. With regard to the children, both parties are asked to guarantee their catholic baptism and education. In the disposition of nature, both parents share in the up-bringing of their children: and so both are required to accept the responsibility for their introduction into the Church by baptism and their continuance in it by education according to catholic principles. This promise holds, even though death or some other reason should leave the non-catholic faced with the sole responsibility of caring for the children. It is no easy responsibility for one who does not know a greal deal about the teachings and practices of Catholicism. Unable to fulfil the task unaided, he would have to call on the help of the schools and such instructors as were available to ensure his children received due knowledge of their religion; and he could see that they attended their duties.

However, the question of one parent alone being left with the care of the children is not taken into account at the time of the marriage, when both parties look forward to a long and happy life together.

Catholic Baptism can usually be hoped for. Catholic education may present a problem. It is a task which extends over many years and includes the training of both intellect and will, instruction in Christian doctrine and the development of the Christian virtues. When estimating what should be included in the marriage promises, we should avoid asking too much as well as being content with too little. It is beyond reasonable attainment that the children of every marriage will possess the knowledge of a theologian and the virtue of a saint. How often do we find that catholics who had parents beyond reproach have not followed the precepts and example of their youth? Every child should know the truths which will enable him to save his soul: the principal mysteries of religion, the commandments of God, the meaning of the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist and how to receive them worthily, what the Mass is, the precepts of the Church, how to pray and seek the intercession of our blessed Mother Mary and the Saints. If we can foresee that the parties to a mixed marriage will take steps to have their children sufficiently taught these and similar fundamental truths, according to their capacity to learn, we can be satisfied about their instruction. With regard to practice, if the catholic parent is remiss the children are under an added disadvantage. Nevertheless, if both promise to have their children prepared for the Sacraments and to see that they attend their religious duties, we can normally secure no better guarantee. When there is every reason to believe the children will be sent to a catholic school, fears for their future would seem to be less founded. After they have out-grown parental control, the lives of the children are their own responsibility before God. Our concern at the time of their parents' marriage is that we can have reasonable assurance that when they reach the age of independence, they will be conscious of their responsibilities and know how to be faithful to them.

3. The third condition is moral certainty as to the promises: that they are sincerely given and will be faithfully implemented. We can be obviously more certain about present sincerity than we can about future observance of what is promised. As remarked

above, moral certainty is not a very precise term, when applied to human actions, especially those which are yet in the distant future. The giving of the guarantees in writing after the five instructions prescribed by the Fourth Plenary Council will create a strong presumption in favour of the sincerity of the parties. If the pastor has reason to doubt their good faith, he should mention his doubts to the Ordinary, who may prescribe other means of testing their sincerity. The future carrying out of the guarantees depends on many factors at present unknown and hidden. We have mostly to rely on the principle that honest people mean what they say, unless we have good reason to suspect them. The giving of the guarantees is the normal means of arriving at moral certainty that there is no undue risk to the faith of the catholic party to the marriage or of the children.

A catholic young man, who brings his intended wife to the priest to arrange for his marriage, has not lost the faith. During the years to come, he may need help from those competent and willing to give it, but he has no intention of rearing his children as non-catholics. The submission of his partner to the conditions required by the Church for a dispensation provides a sound argument for her good dispositions and a means of arriving at some certainty regarding the children's education.

To turn the pair away because the catholic is careless may have even more disastrous results, which we should make every endeavour to avoid. The admonition of the Church's law in can. 1064 applies to pastors of souls. It is their obligation to deter the faithful from mixed marriages, as far as lies in their power; but if they cannot prevent them, they should strive by all means to prevent their being contracted in violation of the laws of God and of the Church. The same canon also enjoins that after a mixed marriage has been celebrated, either in their own territory or elsewhere, pastors must watch diligently to see that the parties faithfully discharge the promises they have made. The pastoral care of the priest is one of the best means of ensuring that mixed marriages are a source of increase for the Church and not an occasion of loss of souls.

To answer the question: May a dispensation be granted when the catholic party has partially or totally lapsed from the faith and, despite instruction and persuasion, it appears will not give the example necessary if the children are to remain practising Catholics? Since there does not seem to be question

that they will be catholics, the answer is 'Yes.' They will receive the faith. The want of example on the part of the parents will have to be supplied otherwise. When calculating the possibilities of the future it is sometimes well to take into account the good as well as the bad qualities to be found in human nature, and not to overlook the supernatural help of divine grace. To deny the sacraments to any catholic is a serious matter. The man whom the priest refuses to marry will not come back to the Church again; and his children will not be catholics, even careless ones. At any rate, it is the Ordinary who has to be satisfied about the conditions; and if the priest submits the application for the dispensation and it is granted, he can conscientiously assist at the marriage. If the Ordinary refuses the dispensation, the priest should attempt again to bring his parishioner to a proper frame of mind, and when he has succeeded re-submit the application.

* * *

2. The confessor may well take his guide as to the mind of the Church from what is stated in can. 1064 with regard to pastors of souls. If he discovers that his penitent is keeping company with a non-catholic, he should endeavour to prevent the mixed marriage; or if this is not possible to see that the marriage is entered upon according to the laws of God and the Church. A mixed marriage can be prevented in two ways: by the conversion of the non-catholic, and by breaking off the friendship which will likely lead to matrimony. A penitent who thinks he has good reason to proceed with his intentions of entering marriage, should be urged to approach his parish priest at the earliest opportunity. This will allow time for the necessary instructions and perhaps provide an occasion, in the designs of Providence, for the conversion of the non-catholic. At any rate, it will enable the pastor to investigate the case and decide whether he should apply to the Ordinary for a dispensation. When the penitent agrees to interview his parish priest, it seems he is disposed for absolution, as he has no intention of marrying contrary to the divine or ecclesiastical laws. Only when he obstinately refuses to make any enquiries as to his position regarding the proposed marriage, and is determined to be married no matter what the Church has to say, would he have to be denied absolution; and we venture the opinion that such a man would scarcely go to Confession at all.

It may be asked whether it is within the competency of the confessor to judge the sufficiency of the grounds for a dispensation. Does not this rather pertain to the Superior who grants the dispensation? A dispensation for a mixed marriage is given in the external forum, and all discussions concerning it are better left to the attention of the pastor who will eventually refer the matter to the Ordinary.

* * *

3. The expression: "catholics who no longer practise the faith" may have a variety of meanings. It is assumed it refers to those who no longer attend Mass regularly or frequent the Sacraments, but still profess their allegiance to the true faith. The priest will admonish them to return to the practice of their religion and induce them to go to the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist in preparation for their marriage. There is no impediment to their marriage; and it is hard to know what other course is open but to assist at their wedding. They need some instruction and exhortation and afterwards will require special attention from the pastor. Their children may be careless catholics; but they will most likely have the faith. The risk of carelessness in the children may be taken because otherwise greater evils would follow, among them the total loss to the Church of both parents and children.

Can. 1066 deals with public sinners, who refuse to be reconciled with the Church. The parish priest is not to assist at their marriages, unless there be grave reasons concerning which he should consult the Ordinary if possible. We would hesitate to apply the term "public sinner" to those who are merely careless: it implies some notorious and grave violation of the laws of God or of the Church. Coranata[4] would call public sinners those who were notoriously absent from their annual confession and communion for several years. Those who attend the missions and receive the Sacraments occasionally are to be found in any parish. We cannot refuse them the Sacraments when they ask for them.

CAUSES FOR A DISPENSATION

A law is promulgated for the good of the community, and so any departure from it is presumably not in the best interest of

---

[4]Institutiones Iuris Canonici. Marietti. 1949. Vol. II, n.816,f.

the common welfare. It is impossible, however, for a human legislator to allow for all possibilities; and there might arise circumstances generally prevailing in which his law would no longer remain an instrument of good but become an occasion of evil. It would then cease to be a just law and would have no binding force. In other cases, the general purpose of the law could remain effective, although in particular instances its operation would prove difficult or accompanied by hardship to the individual or even to the community as a whole. In these circumstances, the Superior or Legislator on whose authority the law has been promulgated will grant a dispensation. A dispensation, then, is a relaxation of the law in a particular case, granted by a legitimate Superior for sufficient reason. The Legislator may dispense without a cause, but in doing so he would act unreasonably, since his law is for the common good, and a departure from it without some reason is to the detriment of the community. A person entrusted with the power of dispensing in the laws of his Superior, cannot act validly if there is no cause for the dispensation.

The matrimonial laws which are of purely ecclesiastical origin, absolutely speaking, can be dispensed, although there are some from which the Church does not grant a dispensation, even in danger of death. These are the impediments arising from the sacred Order of Priesthood and affinity in the direct line, when the marriage giving rise to the affinity has been consummated. (can. 1043) The cause for a dispensation must be in proportion to the gravity of the law in question. A lesser reason would suffice for the more distant degrees of consanguinity or affinity than for the nearer degrees. Strictly, there is no exhaustive list of causes which are or are not sufficient; and human nature is so complex that it would be impossible to enumerate the causes which could arise. There are, however, certain causes more frequently occurring, and in the practice of the Roman Curia they are considered as having weight to influence the Superior towards granting the dispensation. They are usually known as canonical causes. Others are not canonical, and in themselves are not considered sufficient to warrant a departure from the law. They give weight to the arguments for the petition, and several of them together may be morally equivalent to a canonical cause and be a motive for the dispensation.

The S. Congregation of Propaganda published a list of canonical causes on 9th May 1877. They will be found in the text books and as most priests will have a recollection of them, there seems no need to repeat the list here. Angustia loci; aetas feminae superadulta; nimia, suspecta, periculosa familiaritas; copula . . . praegantia . . . ideoque legitimatio prolis; periculum matrimonii mixti vel coram acatholica ministro celebrandi; periculum incestuosi concubinatus; periculum matrimonii civilis; cessatio publici concubinatus (v.g. to validate an invalid marriage already attempted extra Ecclesiam) etc.

Other causes which may be admitted in modern jurisprudence are: Promissio amplectendi religionem Catholicam; spes fundata conversionis partis acatholicae; infamia mulieris ex suspicione orta; grave periculum incontinentiae etc.

The causes which have most weight for a dispensation from the impediments of mixed religion and disparity of worship are those which have relation to the public good (reparatio scandali, cessatio publici concubinatus etc.) or the spread of the faith (promissio amplectendi religionem Catholicam; spes fundata partis acatholicae). The others are not excluded, especially if there be several of them present in the one case. (See Bouscaren-Ellis. *Canon Law*. Bruce Publishing Co. Milwaukee, 1946, p. 437, note 77: Cappello. *De Sacramentis* Marietti, Turin. 1947, vol. V. n. 314). Periculum matrimonii civilis vel coram ministello acatholico, is in itself a good and valid cause; but if used as a threat it ceases to be in bonum animarum: the parties have already made up their minds, irrespective of any legislation of the Church, and are unworthy to receive favours from her.

JAMES MADDEN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Canon Law

POSITION CONCERNING RITE OF A NON-CATHOLIC OF THE ORIENTAL RITE ON HIS CONVERSION TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH — EFFECT OF HIS CONVERSION CONCERNING THE RITE OF THE CHILDREN OF HIS MARRIAGE

Dear Rev. Sir,

Would you be so kind as to clarify for me the position in the following case:

Basil, of Russian Orthodox Rite, married Mary, of Latin Rite, in the Catholic Church. Their first child has been baptized in the Church. Now, Basil himself is considering becoming a Catholic.

In that event, may Basil, or even must he, retain his own Rite on becoming a Catholic? Also, what is the position regarding the Rite of the children, both present and future?

IGNORANS

REPLY

Of the utmost importance in the solution of our correspondent's queries, and especially his first query, is the Motu Proprio *Cleri Sanctitati* of Pope Pius XII. This document is the Apostolic Motu Proprio by means of which the fourth part of the Code of Oriental Canon Law was promulgated. This promulgation took place on 15th August 1957, and the laws contained in the Motu Proprio became effective on 25th March 1958. This particular part of the Oriental Code of Canon Law is concerned with Rites and Persons (De Ritibus Orientalibus et de Personis); and hence it has special importance and application in regard to our correspondent's questions which are concerned with the matter of Rites.

In the first place our correspondent asks whether Basil may, or even must, retain his own rite on becoming a Catholic. At the outset it may be remarked that when our correspondent states that Basil is of the Orthodox Rite he is equivalently stating that Basil is baptized. This consideration is relevant to the case in the sense that an *unbaptized* person who desires to embrace the Catholic Faith may freely choose any rite, whether Oriental or Latin. This principle is also affirmed in canon 12 of

De Ritibus Orientalibus of the Oriental Code. However, on the facts as presented by our correspondent we are certainly justified in assuming that Basil is baptized; and consequently our discussion of these queries will suppose that Basil is validly baptized, even though he is not as yet a member of the Catholic Church.

Thus, the question is whether Basil, a validly baptized member of the Oriental Rite—even though not a Catholic—may, or even must, retain his own Oriental Rite upon his conversion to the Catholic Church. As far as the Latin Code of Canon Law is concerned in this matter canon 98, §3 affirms that no one is allowed, without the authorization of the Holy See, to pass from one rite to another. The ruling of this canon, however, refers only to a transfer from the Latin Rite to the Oriental Rite and vice-versa. It does not refer to any transition from one Oriental rite to another Oriental rite since the Latin Code of Canon Law, after all, does not legislate for the Oriental Church as such and in the case of a transfer of that nature it is clear that only Oriental discipline is concerned. Moreover, as the phrase at the beginning of this canon *inter varios catholicos ritus* suggests, the Latin Code is legislating only in regard to the relationships between Catholics of these Rites and the matter of non-catholics does not as such enter into the case. For these reasons it seems clear that canon 98 of the Latin Code does not provide the answer to our correspondent's question, since in the proposed case Basil is a non-catholic and may even have in mind to choose another Oriental rite when he becomes a Catholic.

It does seem, however, that a completely satisfactory solution to this question can be derived from that part of the Oriental Code of Canon Law which was promulgated in the Motu Proprio *Cleri Sanctitati.* It is clear from canon 8 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus* that the permission of the Holy See is required for the validity of a transfer from one rite to another; and also that this permission is required, not only for the validity of a transfer from an Oriental rite to the Latin Rite (which is in accord with the ruling of canon 98 §3 of the Latin Code), but also for the validity of a transfer from any Oriental rite to another Oriental rite. In other words, as far as the Oriental Church is concerned, it embraces any transfer of rite.

However, the new Oriental Code makes an exception. This

Code sets down a special norm for the case in which a baptized non-catholic of an Oriental rite desires to become a member of the Catholic Church. In the first place, especially in view of certain preceding remarks concerning the Latin Code, it is to be noted that the Oriental Code introduces a clear distinction in this matter between Catholics and baptized non-catholics, and it legislates in a special way for baptized non-catholics of the Oriental Rite. In canon 11 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus* the principle is set down that baptized non-catholics of the Oriental Rite who desire to become members of the Catholic Church may choose any rite, including the Latin Rite. This provision marks a clear departure from the law that existed in the Oriental Church prior to the promulgation of this part of the Oriental Code of Canon Law. The previous law had also allowed baptized Oriental non-catholics an option upon conversion, but the option had simply extended to the various Oriental rites themselves. In other words, a baptized non-catholic of the Oriental Rite could, in becoming a Catholic, freely choose any of the Oriental rites without the necessity of an Apostolic authorization; but if, upon his conversion, he desired to embrace the Latin Rite this special permission of the Holy See was necessary.

This pre-Oriental Code discipline was confirmed in certain special replies given by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church in response to certain questions that were proposed to it. These questions and replies were published in the October 1953 issue of the Australasian Catholic Record (pp. 280-281). In reply to the question as to whether a baptized non-catholic of the Oriental Rite who desires to be converted to the Catholic Church can change his rite, the Sacred Congregation replied: "He may choose between the Oriental rites; but he may not choose the Latin Rite without the permission of the Apostolic See" (Ibid., n.4). This restriction is now removed by the Oriental Code as from 25th March 1958, so that a baptized non-catholic of the Oriental Rite, who wishes to become a member of the Catholic Church, may now freely choose any Oriental rite or the Latin Rite without any necessity for obtaining the authorization of the Holy See for the transfer in any case.

We may now apply the foregoing principles to the case presented by our correspondent. In the case Basil is a baptized non-catholic of the Oriental Rite, and the question is whether

Basil "may, or even must, retain his own Rite on becoming a Catholic." From the principles which have now been set down the following conclusions may legitimately be deduced. (1) Basil does not have an obligation to retain his own rite on becoming a Catholic; although, according to canon 11 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus,* it is desirable that he should retain it: (2) Basil may, on his conversion, choose to retain his own rite, or to embrace any Oriental rite, or even to embrace the Latin Rite: (3) No matter what Basil's choice may be, whether it involves a change of rite or not, he may choose freely without the necessity of obtaining permission from the Holy See; this permission in such a case is not required either for validity or for lawfulness.

The second question proposed by our correspondent really consists of two parts: (a) What is the position regarding Rite of the child who has already been born of the marriage between Basil and Mary, that is, before Basil has become a Catholic? (b) What will be the position regarding Rite of any children who may be born in the future, that is, after Basil has become a Catholic?

Canon 756 of the Latin Code of Canon Law sets down the following principles: "§1. The child must be baptized in the rite of the parents: §2. If one of the parents belongs to the Latin Rite and the other to the Oriental Rite, the child is to be baptized in the rite of the father, unless it is otherwise provided by particular law: §3. If only one of the parents is a Catholic, the child is to be baptized in the rite of this parent."

As far as the case proposed by our correspondent is concerned it is the third section of canon 756 that enables us to determine the rite of the child who has already been born of this marriage, since at this stage only one of the parents, namely Mary, is a Catholic. Thus, this child, who according to our correspondent "has been baptized in the Church," must be regarded as belonging to the Latin Rite since the rule states that where one parent is a non-catholic, whether it be the father or the mother, the child is to be baptized in the rite of the Catholic parent; and in this particular case the Catholic parent belongs to the Latin Rite. This is clearly confirmed by one of the replies contained among the responses given by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church and to which reference was made in replying to our correspondent's first question. For, in reply to the question as to what is the rite of a child born of a marriage between a

woman of the Latin Rite and an Oriental non-catholic, the Sacred Congregation declared that the child belongs to the same rite as the Catholic spouse (cfr. A.C.R., October 1953, pp. 280-281, n.3). Moreover, even if this child had been unlawfully baptized by a priest of another rite in violation of the ruling of this canon, the child would still belong to the Latin Rite; for the Code Commission has authentically declared that in such a case the child does not cease to belong to the rite in which the baptism should have been conferred (Code Commission, 16th October 1919; cfr. Bouscaren, Canon Law Digest, vol. I, p. 337). When, therefore, these principles are applied to our proposed case, it will be seen that there can be no doubt that the child born before Basil has become a Catholic belongs to the Latin Rite.

We now come to treat of the second aspect of this second question of our correspondent, namely, the position regarding the rite of the children who may be born after Basil has become a Catholic. It has already been pointed out in the reply to the first question that there may be various possibilities when Basil becomes a Catholic. Thus, he may retain his own Oriental rite, or he may transfer to another Oriental rite, or he may embrace the Latin Rite. If he retains his own Oriental rite or embraces another Oriental rite so that both parents are Catholics but one parent (the wife) belongs to the Latin Rite and one parent (the husband) belongs to an Oriental rite, the rule that is to be applied in the case is the principle of canon 756, §2. This section of the canon states that in such a case the children are to be baptized in the rite of the father. Thus, in the event that Basil becomes a Catholic of an Oriental rite, whether his own rite or another Oriental rite, the children who may be born of the marriage after his conversion are to be baptized in that rite and will belong to that rite. If, however, in accordance with the ruling of canon 11 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus* Basil embraces the Latin Rite, the children to be born of the marriage are to be baptized in the Latin Rite and will belong to that Rite; for in this case both parents would belong to the Latin Rite and thus canon 756, §1 must be applied, namely, that the children are to be baptized in the rite of the parents. This would mean that in our proposed case all the children of the marriage, whether born before or after Basil's conversion to the Latin Rite, would themselves belong to the Latin Rite, although the determining principles

in the two cases — before and after conversion — would not be identical.

However, there is another aspect to be considered in this matter; it is the position of the child who has already been born of this marriage when the conversion of Basil takes place. By virtue of the ruling of canon 756, §3 this child has been lawfully baptized in the Latin Rite and belongs to that Rite. If Basil at his conversion embraces the Latin Rite there will not be any difficulty in determining the rite of the child already born of the marriage; it could only be the Latin Rite. But the question is: Does this child retain the Latin Rite after the conversion of the father if he (the father) retains his own Oriental rite or chooses another Oriental rite?

Canon 10 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus* states that if the father or, in a mixed marriage, the Catholic mother lawfully changes from one rite to another rite, those children who have not attained the age of puberty automatically pass to that same rite. Certainly, therefore, if the child already born of the marriage of Basil and Mary has attained the age of puberty at the time of Basil's conversion, that child would not be automatically affected by any change of rite on the part of Basil. But it might conceivably be argued that if this child has not attained the age of puberty at the time of Basil's conversion canon 10 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus*—referred to above—would imply that Basil's embracing of another Oriental rite on his conversion would automatically involve the same transfer of rite for this child, hitherto a member of the Latin Rite.

However, while admitting the possibility of controversy on this point and perhaps even the likelihood of a special authoritative clarification in the future, it seems to us that the child born before Basil's conversion, even if still under the age of puberty, would not be automatically affected by the father's selection of another Oriental rite; that is, in our present case the child born of the marriage between Basil and Mary, even if under the age of puberty, will remain a member of the Latin Rite in which he was lawfully incorporated by baptism, and will not pass *ipso iure* to any Oriental rite that may be chosen by Basil upon his reception into the Catholic Church. Thus, in canon 10 of *De Ritibus Orientalibus* the legislator clearly distinguishes between two categories of marriages, namely, mixed marriages

in which the mother is the Catnolic and other marriages, i.e., catholic marriages and mixed marriages in which the father is the Catholic. In marriages which belong to the second category, the change of rite by the Catholic father automatically produces the same effect in the children of the marriage who have not attained the age of puberty; while in marriages which belong to the first category only the change of rite by the Catholic mother produces this effect and, by implication, the change of rite by the non-catholic father does not cause this automatic transition for the children under the age of puberty. And this appears to us to be true even when the change of rite by the non-catholic father coincides with his reception into the Catholic Church; for it is not a Catholic father who is changing his rite but a non-catholic father who changes his rite in the act of his conversion. There is a difference between changing one's rite as a Catholic and changing one's rite in becoming a Catholic. Thus, so long as the Catholic mother in a mixed marriage does not change her rite—and this is the situation in the case proposed by our correspondent—a child under the age of puberty is not affected by any change of rite on the part of the other parent.

Consequently, in view of the preceding explanations of the various points involved in our correspondent's questions, it seems to us that the whole matter may be summarized in the following propositions: (1) Basil may retain his own rite on becoming a Catholic, or he may freely choose any other rite, whether Oriental or Latin: (2) The children born after Basil's conversion to the Catholic Church will be of the same rite as Basil will have chosen on his conversion: (3) The child already born of the marriage before Basil's reception into the Catholic Church and already baptized in the Latin Rite will retain that Rite after Basil's conversion, whether Basil retains his own rite or chooses another rite.

WAR PENSIONS AND RELIGIOUS OF SIMPLE VOWS.

Dear Rev. Sir,

The following case of Canon Law was put to me by a religious. I would be pleased if you would consider answering it in your Review.

A religious with simple and temporary vows is entitled to a pension by reason of war injuries, received by him prior to

his entering his Institute. The pension is paid to him by the Commonwealth Military authorities. He claims that the pension is part of his patrimony, and that therefore he has the right to dispose of it within the terms of the Code. His religious superiors contend that it is not part of his patrimony, and that it should be handed over to them, as by using it himself he would violate his vow of poverty.

Is the view of the religious the correct one, or must the pension be handed over to the Institute?

CANONICUS.

REPLY

In replying to this query it is to be noted in the first place that the question is concerned with a religious who has made profession of simple vows and not solemn vows. Now, as far as the matter of property is concerned in its relations to professed religious of simple vows, the provisions of two canons have a special application and importance. Canon 569, §1 states: "Before the profession of simple vows, whether temporary or perpetual, a novice must, for the entire period during which he will be bound by simple vows, cede the administration of his property to whomsoever he wishes and, unless the constitutions provide otherwise, freely dispose of their use and income." And canon 580 states: "§1. Every professed religious of simple vows, whether perpetual or temporary, unless it is otherwise stated in the constitutions, retains the ownership of his property and the capacity of acquiring other property, without prejudice, however, to be the provisions of canon 569: §2. Whatever a religious acquires by personal industry or in consideration of the fact that he is a religious, belongs to the religious institute."

The relevant implications of these canons, therefore, may be summarized as follows: (1) A professed religious of simple vows retains the right of ownership of property: (2) A professed religious of simple vows continues to own that property which was rightfully his at the time of profession: (3) Such a religious can lawfully acquire and own new property even after he has made profession of simple vows: (4) Although such a religious retains the actual ownership of his property he does not administer it, but prior to his profession he freely hands over the actual administration to a person whom he chooses: (5) Before making

religious profession this religious must also have made provision for the use to which any income accruing from his property is to be devoted: (6) This cession of administration and use will also apply to any property that is acquired after religious profession: (7) In fact, a religious of simple vows cannot give away his property except by last will in accordance with canon 569, §3: (8) Property that is given to such a religious in consideration of the fact that he is a religious belongs to the religious institute itself: (9) Property that is acquired by such a religious through personal industry as a religious, e.g., remuneration for preaching and writing, Mass stipends, etc., belongs to the religious institute.

It is our opinion that these general principles will enable us to determine the answer to be given to our correspondent's query; and it will then be our endeavour to show that this answer is in fact confirmed by a conclusion legitimately derived from a special reply of the Sacred Congregation of Religious which is concerned with the same subject-matter as the query of our correspondent.

In the first place, it is to be noted that our correspondent clearly states that the war pension which is being paid to the professed religious of simple vows in the case is the result of injuries that had been received prior to his becoming a religious; and indeed we may justifiably assume that the religious was actually in receipt of this pension before he became a religious. If there is something that may be described as being a little out-of-the-ordinary about the property in question it is that the property is not something that as such was possessed in its entirety before religious profession, but rather is of a continuing nature and as such could not be otherwise; and thus instalments will continue to come to the person even after he has made religious profession. Notwithstanding the "instalment nature" of the property under consideration, two important factors appear to be established beyond any reasonable doubt: (1) The title to this pension existed before the person in question made his religious profession, and, even though it was not entirely possessed in actual fact, there was the certain guarantee and knowledge of its secure continuation in the future: (2) The property in question is something which even now is not acquired by his personal industry as a religious or given to him in con-

sideration of his status as a religious. Now it appears to us that these two factors together with the additional factor that a professed religious of simple vows is capable of retaining and acquiring ownership of property, compel the conclusion that in the case proposed by our correspondent the war-pension is the property of the religious and is not as such to be regarded as belonging to the religious institute. Of course, the administration and disposition of income must be provided for in accordance with the provisions of law.

On 16th March 1922 a number of special replies were given by the Sacred Congregation of Religious, and these replies related to questions concerning pensions received by religious as a result of their military service during the war. It appears to us that the implications of these replies confirm the opinion which we have set out above as the lawful conclusion from the general principles that are applicable in this matter. Certain of these replies are concerned with religious of solemn vows; while other replies are concerned with professed religious of simple vows. It is this second category that is applicable in our present case, since our correspondent's query relates only to a professed religious of simple vows.

In the fifth of this series of replies the Sacred Congregation declared that in the case of a religious of simple vows who is receiving a pension as a result of war injuries the pension belongs to the religious institute if the religious was bound by vows during the period of his military service; but that, if his vows were suspended during the period of military service, the pension belongs to the religious himself but he must give it to the institute so long as he continues to be a member of it. At first sight it might appear that this reply of the Sacred Congregation is in opposition to the conclusion at which we have arrived through the application of the relevant general principles. But we believe that a closer examination of this reply and its implications will confirm our conclusion.

While it is true that according to the above reply of the Sacred Congregation the pension received as the consequence of war injuries is to be given to the religious institute, it is also true that the reply is based upon a very important assumption. The assumption is that the religious in question should already

have made religious profession at the time of receiving the war injuries with the resulting pension, whether he was actually bound by the vows or whether these vows had been suspended; and it seems to be clear that this fact of previous religious profession constitutes the justification of the ruling. But in the case proposed by our correspondent the war injuries and the title to the title to the pension have been acquired by a person who, although he is now a professed religious, had not made religious profession at the time the title to the pension was established. At that time he was not bound by religious vows nor had his vows been suspended; he simply was not a religious at all but a layman, and thus the title to the pension had been established independently of any religious institute and independently of his present status as a religious which, as far as the war injuries and pension as such are concerned, is incidental and may never have been acquired. This appears to be most consistent with canon 580, §2, which requires some identification with the religious institute when the property is acquired. The fact that the pension will continue to come to him after his profession does not appear to alter the case. It simply is, and remains, something to which he is entitled independently of any religious status; but it happens to be something which of its nature is not possessed immediately in its entirety but continues to come to the religious by way of instalments. However, since his right to it is established and he is able to call it his own, it should be included in the document of cession of administration of property and disposal of income to be drawn up before religious profession. Thus, it appears to us that, in the words of our correspondent, this religious "has the right to dispose of it within the terms of the Code."

In confirmation of this opinion it may be remarked that the other replies of the Sacred Congregation of Religious in the series from which the above reply is taken are worded in a similar manner. That is, as far as religious of simple vows are concerned these replies appear to us always to suppose the fact of a previous religious profession if the religious institute itself is to be the recipient of pensions, bonuses, etc., received by religious in consequence of their military service.

G. C. GALLEN.

St. Mary's Cathedral, Sydney.

Liturgy

DECREE OF THE HOLY OFFICE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNION IN THE AFTERNOON AND EVENING

Amongst the *Official Documents* of this number (pp. 184-185) will be found the Decree issued by the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office on 21st March, 1960, concerning the distribution of Holy Communion to the faithful outside of Mass during the afternoon and evening (*A.A.S.*, LII (1960), pp. 355-356).

The importance of the decree will have escaped no one, while at the same time it raises in our minds a number of theological and pastoral questions of some consequence. It is proposed, then, to consider the disciplinary terms of the decree, and to add some further considerations that may prove helpful in the practical application of this latest proof of the Church's solicitude for the spiritual well-being of her children.

To place the decree in its proper context we should recall the existing legislation concerning the distribution of Communion outside of Mass, as distinct from Communion in association with Mass, and Communion of the sick.

Several canons of the Code of Canon Law bear on the point. Canon 846, §2: 'Even outside of Mass any priest enjoys the same faculty (of distributing Communion), with at least the presumed permission of the rector of the church if he is a stranger.' Canon 867, §4: 'Holy Communion may be distributed only at those times within which the sacrifice of the Mass may be celebrated, unless a reasonable cause suggests otherwise.' The times for the celebration of Mass are fixed by Canon 821, §1: 'Mass may not begin earlier than an hour before dawn, nor later than an hour after midday.' (Paragraphs 2 and 3 of the same canon regulate Masses on Christmas Day). Of less immediate concern to our present purpose, is the place for the distribution of Communion as determined in Canon 869: 'Holy Communion may be distributed wherever Mass may be lawfully celebrated, including privates oratories, unless the local Ordinary has, for some just reason, forbidden this in particular cases.'

From the above it is clear that the Code did not require anything more than 'a reasonable cause' to justify the distribution of Communion outside Mass and even before or after the hours

within which Mass had to be celebrated. Authors pointed out that a grave cause was not demanded.[1] On this score the Code showed itself rather more lenient than the majority of pre-Code authors.[2]

CHRISTUS DOMINUS.

To meet the changed social and industrial conditions of modern life, to alleviate the burden of the Eucharistic fast for women engaged in domestic duties and for school children, and to enable all the faithful to assist at Mass and receive Holy Communion more frequently, Pope Pius XII published the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus*, 6th January, 1953. This Constitution mitigated the general law for the Eucharistic fast and empowered Local Ordinaries to grant permission for the celebration of evening Masses on determined days. The distribution of Communion to the faithful was allowed at these evening Masses (*A.A.S.*, XLV (1953), pp. 15-24; *A.C.R.*, 1953, pp. 93-100).

The *Instruction* of the Holy Office issued together with the Apostolic Constitution laid down: 'The faithful may receive Holy Communion *during*, or *immediately before or after* (cfr. can. 846, §1) evening Mass even though they do not belong to the category of persons for whose benefit this Mass has been introduced.' (n. 15. *A.A.S.* XLV (1953), p. 50; *A.C.R.*, 1953, pp. 100-104).

In 1955 (16th November), the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued the Decree and Instruction which introduced the Restored Order of Holy Week (A.A.S., XLVII (1955), pp. 838-847). The rules for the distribution of Communion on Maundy Thursday, Good Friday and Holy Saturday were contained in the *Instruction*, nn. 18-19 (cfr. also S.R.C., *Ordinan. and Declarat.*, 1st February, 1957, nn. 11 and 18; *A.C.R.*, 1957, pp. 97-102).

By the Motu Proprio *Sacram Communionem*, of 19th March, 1957, Pope Pius XII further extended the indults given in *Christus Dominus*. The Pope recalled the reasons which had prompted the earlier Constitution: 'In order that the faithful may be enabled to receive Holy Communion frequently, and satisfy more easily the precept of hearing Mass on feast days.' Moved by the abundant fruits that had accrued from this earlier concession,

---

[1] e.g. Coronata, *De Sacramentis*, Turin, 1943, vol. i, n. 337; Cappello, *De sacramentis*, Rome, 1945, vol. i, nn. 373, 381; Madden, *A.C.R.*, 1957, pp. 315-318.

[2] cfr. Iung, *Dict. Droit Canon.*, iii, 1147.

many Bishops had requested the Holy Father to give them the faculty of permitting afternoon Masses every day. 'In consideration of the notable changes which the order of work and public offices and even the whole life of society have undergone,' the Pope 'decided that the insistent requests of the Bishops should be satisfied.' He decreed, therefore, that 'Local Ordinaries (excepting Vicars General without a special mandate) can permit the celebration of Mass during the afternoon and evening hours of each day, if the spiritual good of a considerable number of the faithful requires it.' (*A.A.S.*, XLIX (1957); pp. 177-178; *A.C.R.*, 1957, pp. 97-98). The norm for the distribution of Communion at these Masses remained as previously determined in *Christus Dominus*, i.e., during, or immediately before or after the Mass.

In commenting on the Apostolic Constitution *Christus Dominus* some authors considered that it was permissible to distribute Communion during the afternoon or evening to persons who had observed the required fast (including the mitigations introduced for various categories by the Apostolic Constitution), and this even in churches in which an evening Mass was not celebrated. However, others would not accept this interpretation, and they insisted that Communion was allowed in the afternoon or evening only in association with an evening Mass.[3] At the same time they would not consider that the exception provided for in can. 867, §4 ('unless a reasonable cause suggests otherwise') had been changed.

Subsequent to the publication of the *Motu Proprio* by Pope Pius XII, Cardinal Ottaviani, Pro-Secretary of the Holy Office, discussed the question of the distribution of Communion in the afternoon or evening outside of Mass in relation to can. 867, §4. The article was published in the review *Studi Cattolici* (June, 1957), and was widely referred to in various publications.[4] 'The celebration of Mass in the afternoon requires the permission of the local Ordinary for the benefit of a notable part of the faithful and the afternoon is not the time *de iure* for Mass. Consequently, the permission for Communion after the time for "morning Mass" is restricted to what was granted in the Constitution *Christus Dominus*, i.e., during the Mass and immediately before or after it. The spirit of the concessions, the Cardinal explains, is to promote the attendance of the people at

[3] Thus Castellano in *Monitor ecclesiast.*, 1954, pp. 48-49.
[4] cfr. *ACR.*, 1957, p. 317.

Mass, and this purpose would be frustrated if Communion were to be distributed at any hour to whoever asked for it.'[5]

Two private replies given by the Sacred Congregation of Rites are in the same tenor, namely *Pisan.*, 21 Maii 1957, *Ianuen.*, 21 Iunii 1957, ad 3.[6]

RECENT DECREE

It is against this background of legislation and interpretation that we must consider the recent decree. The question proposed to the Holy Office recalls the terms of canon 867, §4, and in particular the phrase 'unless some reasonable cause suggests otherwise.' Next it points to the mitigation of the Eucharistic fast introduced by *Christus Dominus,* the permission for evening Masses, and the rule for the distribution of Communion in connection with the evening Mass. In a *monitum,* 22nd March, 1957, the Holy Office reminded Ordinaries that the evening Masses were intended for the 'common good of the faithful,' not for the benefit of individuals or for external solemnity. Then, on 19th March, 1957, came the *Motu Proprio,* which allowed evening Masses daily for the spiritual well-being of a 'notable part of the faithful.' In view of this insistence upon the spiritual welfare of at least a notable group of people, and taking account of the specific rules for Communion at evening Masses, is it still possible to maintain that the final phrase of canon 867, §4 retains its full force? In other words, can we still maintain that, by virtue of this phrase, it is permissible to ask for and to distribute Communion in the afternoon or evening, outside of Mass, for any reasonable cause?

In reply, the Holy Office observes that while the phrase in question has not been formally abrogated, it is true that the mitigation of the Eucharistic fast has greatly reduced the number of cases in which use of the concession would be justified. Since such cases may well occur, and since it is not always possible to provide an afternoon or evening Mass at which the faithful might receive Communion, the Holy Office grants to local Ordinaries a further faculty. In places where there is no afternoon or evening Mass, the Ordinary may allow the distribution of Communion at some sacred function other than Mass, after the fashion of the rules for the distribution of Communion at evening

[5] ibid.
[6] *Ephemer. liturg.*, 1957, p. 316.

Masses, i.e., the observance of the fast, and the distribution must take place during, or immediately before or after the function. Such a sacred function may take place in the afternoon or evening, in parochial and non-parochial churches, and in the chapels of hospitals, prisons and colleges. The local Ordinary must fix the form of the sacred function.

The purpose of this concession is twofold. On the one hand, it makes further provision for the common good of the faithful, who are given an opportunity of receiving Holy Communion even when no evening Mass is available to them. On the other hand, the fixing of a definite public function will ensure that priests are not prevented from attending to their numerous and important pastoral duties by frequent requests for Communion during the afternoon or evening.

Certain conclusions may be drawn from the decree.

1. A reasonable cause may still justify the distribution of Communion in the afternoon or evening outside of Mass, since the final phrase of canon 867, §4 has not been abrogated. The 'reasonableness' of the cause must be judged in the particular circumstances by taking account of a number of factors.

2. From the viewpoint of the fast observed, the fast of three hours prescribed by recent legislation is just as effective a foundation for the reasonable cause as the fast previously calculated from midnight.

3. Account must also be taken of the availability of an evening Mass, or some other form of approved public devotions, during which Communion will be distributed. As stated in the present decree, it will be more difficult to find a reasonable cause since the introduction of the new rules for the Eucharistic fast and evening Masses. One may well doubt the sufficiency of such a cause as the devotion of the communicant, as formerly mentioned by commentators on the Code.

4. Since the present decree explicitly aims at protecting priests against continual interruptions in the discharge of their other pastoral duties, it seems that the priest, from whom Communion is sought, might take account of the established customs of the place in regard to the distribution of Communion outside of Mass. The strong tradition of pastoral activity, such as visitation of homes, hospitals and schools, &c., to which we are accustomed in Australia, has undoubtedly conditioned the faithful to an attitude towards seeking Communion outside of Mass that is apparently very different from that of other countries. When

faced with an individual case, the priest must assess the reasonableness of the cause, and while not demanding physical or moral impossibility of receiving Communion at some public function, he may require a good sound reason, rather more compelling than in times before the institution of evening Masses, and before the distribution of Communion at public devotions in the afternoon or evening.

5. What has been said applies to one or a few individuals. Larger or public groups fall under the conditions which the local Ordinary is empowered to determine. Otherwise the authority given him by the decree would be nullified.

6. The local Ordinary has from the decree the right to fix the form of the 'sacred function' at which Communion may be distributed in the afternoon or evening, in places in which there is no evening Mass.

7. The term 'sacred function' is generic, embracing both liturgical rites, such as Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and exercises of devotion, as Rosary, Stations of the Cross.

8. The decree does not restrict the number of times in a day at which the Ordinary may allow such a sacred function. The spiritual well-being of the faithful is the decisive factor, but in reaching this decision it would be desirable to consider some of the points that will be raised below.

So much for the disciplinary aspects of the question. However, there are a number of other important factors which must be taken into account, if we are to enjoy the full benefit of this latest concession of the Church. For some years there has been a movement to emphasise the close relationship between the holy Sacrifice of the Mass and the reception of Communion by the faithful during Mass. Earlier in the century it was not an uncommon experience for people, including religious communities, to receive Communion regularly before or after Mass, and this for no particular reason. The practice has been gradually eliminated in most places where there is no real need for it, but does not the present decree support a return to the former custom? Does the Church regard Communion outside of Mass as equally commendable to the faithful as Communion during Mass? May we see in the decree an implied recommendation for a greater use of the faculties for evening Masses? These are a few principles and practices which merit some discussion.

MASS AND COMMUNION

For the first thousand years of the Church's history the distribution of Communion outside of Mass, except to the sick and others in very special circumstances, was practically unknown. In the tradition of the Church, Communion was linked with the Eucharistic Sacrifice as the means of participating most fully in It. The Gospel narratives of the institution and the teaching of St. Paul provided a solid foundation for this tradition.[7]

From about the ninth century a tendency developed in some places to postpone the distribution of Communion until after Mass. This practice was at first limited to the greater feasts of the year, especially Easter, when there would be large crowds of people wishing to receive Communion. But even in this case, Communion was still associated with the Mass. The separation of the two did not come until after the Council of Trent.

'After the Council of Trent the tendency to separate the Communion from the Mass moved forward by leaps and bounds, since the appreciation of the liturgical pattern did not keep step with the zeal for the sacramental life. At first this held true only for Communion on greater feasts and for general Communions, but later it spread to other occasions also, so that by the time the eighteenth century had faded into the nineteenth, Communion outside of Mass had become the general rule.'[8]

The Council of Trent recommended the frequent reception of Communion (Sess. XIII, *DB.* 880-882), and condemned the error of those who would exclude as unlawful Mass in which only the celebrant communicated. At the same time, the Council clearly formulated the wish that at each Mass the faithful should not content themselves with a spiritual Communion, but should reap the richer fruits of the holy sacrifice by sacramental Communion (Sess. XXII, *DB.* 944).

The attitude towards Communion outside of Mass in the eighteenth century may be gauged from an incident which occurred during the pontificate of Pope Benedict XIV, and which is referred to by Pope Pius XII in his encyclical, *Mediator Dei.*[9] A priest of the cathedral of Crema (Lombardy) decided

[7] cfr. Righetti, *Storia liturgica*, 1949, iii, pp. 473-476; Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, 1955, ii, p. 406ff.; Mariani in *Eucaristia*, 1957, pp. 839-841.

[8] Jungmann, op. cit., ii, pp. 410-411.

[9] Cfr. Vandenbroucke, *Quest. liturg. et paroiss.*, 1950, pp. 166-170.

to give Communion to the faithful with Hosts which he consecrated at his Mass. This aroused the wrath of his fellow clerics and the lay officials attached to the cathedral, who declared the practice contrary to ecclesiastical discipline. Don Guerreri was denounced to the Bishop, to the Doge of Venice and finally to Rome. On 13th November, 1742, Pope Benedict XIV intervened in a letter to the Italian Hierarchy. The Pope said: 'The Church has never forbidden, and does not now forbid, the priest to satisfy the pious and just request of such as desire to be admitted to a share of that same Sacrifice, of which they also—in their own way—are the offerers.' The Pope had previously noted that 'one and the same Sacrifice is shared not only by those who receive from the celebrating priest a part of the Victim which he himself has offered, but also by those to whom he administers the reserved Sacrament.'[10]

Pope Pius XII treated the relation between the Mass and Communion very clearly in his encyclical letter on the Sacred Liturgy. The theory which suggested that the Communion of the faithful is essential to the public sacrificial action is false. The Communion of the priest-celebrant is alone necessary, that of the faithful is only to be highly recommended. The Church desires her children to participate as fully as possible in the Eucharistic Sacrifice. As Trent had declared, sacramental Communion of the faithful present at Mass is the ideal (*Mediator Dei*, nn. 119-127).

'It is very fitting that the faithful, in accordance with the liturgical rule, should approach Holy Communion after the priest has communicated at the altar; and, as We have already said, it is praiseworthy that those who are present at Mass should receive particles which have been consecrated at the same Mass and so give real fulfilment to the words: "that as many of us as have received the body and blood of thy Son by partaking of this altar, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace."

'Nevertheless, reasons frequently occur for distributing Holy Communion either before or after Mass, and, even in cases where it is given immediately after the priest's Communion, for doing so with hosts previously consecrated. In these cases, too, as We have already pointed out, the people truly share the sacrifice, and an easier opportunity is provided for them to communicate. But while the Church makes concessions in her motherly desire to meet the spiritual needs of her children, these on their part

[10] Cfr. *Mediator Dei*, (ECTS Trans. n. 126).

must do all in their power to conform to what the liturgy recommends and, unless there is some reasonable cause to the contrary, do everything that may clearly manifest at the altar the living unity of the Mystical Body' (ibid. nn. 128-129).

The Instruction: *De Musica sacra et sacra Liturgia* (S.R.C., 3rd September, 1958), in discussing the various grades of participation in the Mass, stated: 'Full active participation is finally reached, when *sacramental* participation is also added' (n. 22c, *A.A.S.* L (1958), p. 638).

These are the principles that must be laid before the people very clearly, when offering them an opportunity of receiving Holy Communion in the afternoon or evening outside of Mass. Communion during Mass will ever remain the ideal and normal procedure, for this brings us to the highest degree of union with Christ the High Priest and Victim of the Holy Sacrifice. Communion outside of Mass is for the benefit of those who are prevented from receiving Communion in association with Mass. Consequently, there could never be any question of organizing a group Communion at such an evening function without Mass, except in very extraordinary circumstances. This would be the equivalent of encouraging people to seek Communion outside of Mass without any real need for doing so. The approach to such a situation is, of course, to provide an evening Mass with the appropriate permission of the Ordinary. By this recent decree the Church has offered her children yet another privilege, and it would be quite wrong to deprive the people of the benefits that the Holy See offers them. Yet the proper sense of proportion must be maintained, and the recent concession does not in any way conflict with the principles outlined by Pope Pius XII, following the teaching of the Council of Trent and Pope Benedict XIV.

EVENING MASSES

The decree of the Holy Office seems to direct our attention to the question of evening Masses, and the availing of the opportunities offered us by the Church. The condition on which the Ordinary may grant permission for the distribution of Communion at the afternoon or evening function is that there is no evening Mass. The preference of the Church obviously goes to the Mass, but since it is not always possible to have a Mass, the Church makes this further provision. We note, too, the insistence on the motive underlying all this more recent legislation, the spiritual welfare of a notable part of the faithful.

About twenty people, the commentators tell us, constitutes a notable part of the faithful.

Considering the situation in the average parish in regard to the attendance at week-day Mass, it would seem that we have not always given sufficient thought to the application of the above principles of the Church's legislation. The number of people who can ordinarily attend morning Mass in a parish is comparatively small, and there must be a number of parishes in which at least twenty people would like to avail themselves of a week-day Mass were it celebrated in the afternoon or evening. The actions of the Popes over the last ten years would indicate that these people are entitled to some consideration. The law does not require a hundred or more people to justify an evening Mass, so why be more Catholic than the Pope? In a parish in which it is possible to have only one Mass each day, and at which, if celebrated in the evening as many (at least twenty), if not more, will be present as at the morning Mass, in such a case would the pastor be justified in asking the Ordinary's permission for an evening Mass two or three times a week, even though this would necessitate the omission of the morning Mass of those days? The request would appear to be in full accord with the purpose of the legislation, i.e., the spiritual welfare of the faithful, but, of course, the final decision rests with the local Ordinary. If a second priest is available to say the evening Mass, there would seem to be even a stronger case for making the request. Could the transfer of the daily Mass in a parish, for sufficient reason, from the morning to the evening be any more revolutionary than the changes introduced by *Christus Dominus* and the Motu Proprio of Pius XII?

FORM OF EVENING DEVOTION

The decree of the Holy Office gives the local Ordinary authority to fix the form of the sacred function at which he allows the distribution of Communion. His decisions are, therefore, binding. But in the case of no explicit directions, it might be asked at what stage of the approved devotions should Communion be given. For example, if the devotion consists of the proverbial Rosary (Sermon) and Benediction, should Communion be given before or after the Benediction? The terms of the decree itself would allow the distribution either during or before or after the sacred function. However, it would seem better to follow the pattern of the Church herself, on the day on

which Communion is distributed outside of Mass, i.e., Good Friday. The Communion concludes the liturgy of the passion and death of our Lord. In the Mass, the liturgy of the Word in the fore-Mass serves as a fitting introduction to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, so in the evening devotion the Rosary and Benediction could serve very well as a preparation for the reception of Holy Communion.

P. L. MURPHY.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

THE JESUITS, by Peter Lippert. Second impression. Thomas Nelson and Sons. 131 pp. Price in England, 12/6.

Father Lippert's translator has added the subtitle "A Self-Portrait," which describes very adequately the nature of this work. It is a description of the Order drawn from the documents which are the basis of its own life and work. The Constitutions, the Spiritual Exercises—these above all give the Society of Jesus its form and spirit.

Father Lippert is concerned first with that spirit, in what it consists, and how it is produced in members of the Society, and what 'Jesuit spirituality' means. Then the juridical structure of the Order is described and its mode of organisation and the nature and purpose of the works it undertakes.

In a small book such as this, selection is necessary, and Father Lippert makes his wisely, so that a balanced picture is given. The book is not very attractively written, but there is a shrewd insight shown into the parts of the Society's institute which have particular relevance to modern conditions.

Father Martindale contributes a characteristically vigorous preface.

V.M.

II. THE TRANSFIGURATION OF CHRIST

Inevitably we reveal ourselves in all that we do and say. Our actions, no matter how impersonal, are always an indirect comment on what we are; and in every thing we say the attentive listener will hear a whispered comment on ourselves. The familiar and somewhat over-worked adage could well be adapted: it is not one's eyes but one's deeds and words which are the truest mirror of the soul; and mirror one's secrets they must.

Not even Jesus was exempt from this rather frightening law of life. How could He be, when God Himself conforms to it? The works of God's hands, we are told, proclaim His glory. Like footprints, to use a common patristic image, they betray God's presence and carry the impress of their Maker's greatness. And in something the same way, Christ's works—the wonders He performed, the wise and the holy things He spoke and even the slightest of the virtuous acts for which He was responsible—were a constant proclamation of His secret self to the world. As He says so often in the Gospel of saint John: "the very works which I do bear witness to me" (Jn. v, 36)—His "works" are a witness both to His own integrity and to His special standing in the eyes of God.

Most of the contemporaries of Jesus, however, demanded a more striking demonstration of the truth of His claims. And such a sign was consistently denied them. Swept along by cravings which still engulf hearts—an all-too-human passion for sensible security and a less worthy thirst for the spectacular—rather than by genuine religious interest, the Jews endeavoured to coax from our Lord an explicit statement of His personal status and a convincing proof of this. "If thou be the Christ, tell us openly," was their demand. And to these pleas, unconscious echoes of the taunting demands which Satan himself had made of Him in the desert, Jesus never responded. Ironically, it was to those who already believed—to John the Precursor, at Christ's Baptism in the Jordan, and to Peter, James and John, during the Transfiguration of Christ on the mountain—that the direct and unmistakable token of divine approval, so passionately sought after by the unbelievers, was given. Truly, it is upon "those who have" that God's choicest gifts are showered.

To but a faithful few, on just those few occasions, God Himself, intervening majestically, revealed in a most direct and

a most conclusive way the true dimensions of the dignity of Jesus. And for many reasons, this was a precious gift. It brought to the Baptist and the three Apostles what had been denied to so many others. It made them the privileged witnesses of happenings which, we see now, are unique in the New Testament economy.

Such direct interventions of the Godhead, after all, are momentous exceptions to the rule that God speaks to man only through His Son now that He, the divine Word, had become incarnate (Cf. Hebr. i,1). Their very unusualness points to their importance in the divine scheme. In some ways more akin to the Old Alliance than to the New, they are really a bridge between the two alliances, indicating the happy transition that has now been accomplished.

No longer, they say in effect, will the voice of God thunder out its message to men from lonely mountain tops. It will now be relayed, as it were, and will be heard in the words of the Christ who moved amongst them—"Hear ye Him!" Chosen to witness these declarations, John and the Apostles must herald the news of this change of divine tactics to the world, calling upon their contemporaries to listen to Christ. And to ensure that there be urgency in their call, they are given, in a never to be forgotten experience, special insight into the mysterious personality of Him whom they are to announce. For a fleeting moment they become the confidants of God Himself. Stunned by a sense of the divine majesty and made to feel that they are listening to divine secrets, they are taught to look upon Christ as God Himself saw Him. They assist at what we might call divine pageants; pageants specially "staged" and privately shown. And the purpose of these divinely-staged displays, associated in the Gospels with the Baptism and the Transfiguration of Jesus, was to manifest Christ to them directly and unequivocally.

To speak of these manifestations as privileges accorded to a few favoured initiates is not to say, of course, that they were esoteric visions, meaningful for John and the Apostles and irrelevant for the rest of us. Indeed, the admonition of Jesus not to speak openly of these things "*until* the Son of Man be risen from the dead" suggests that the very opposite is true. What was first a secret entrusted to a few was meant to become, later, a public fact announced to all.

Here we are reminded of a consistent trait of the divine

behaviour. In dispensing his favours to men, God, on so many occasions, first gives to a few those things which He means all to have. Even as He isolates chosen ones to make them the recipients of a special gift, God is thinking of all and hoping ultimately to endow all. In the promise of posterity made to Abraham, for example, all were blessed; when the Holy Spirit descended upon a handful of trembling souls at Pentecost, the whole universe found a new friend; and the message delivered to the Apostles at the Transfiguration is, likewise, part of the patrimony of us all. Almost as much at Peter and James and John, that favoured and well-tried trio, we belong on the mount with the transfigured Christ and are meant, as they were, to find strength and hope and a new understanding of Him and of ourselves in that vision of glory.

As well as teaching the Apostles to know and appreciate Jesus more deeply, the Transfiguration was the occasion for impressing on them a deeper sense of the divine. By intervening to glorify Christ, God showed something of Himself; and this added splendid solemnity to the message which He then delivered. We know from the Gospels how moved saint Peter was by the strange vision of His master's transfiguration and by the majesty of God which was revealed there as the "bright cloud"—a familiar sign of the divine presence in the Old Testament—enveloped the mountain and those on it. Obviously distraught, the three disciples flung themselves on the ground "very much afraid" (Mth. xvii,6); and yet, at the very same moment, they appear to have been strangely consoled by what they experienced, for Peter, on behalf of them all, could make his bizarre proposal to erect some tents and remain on there indefinitely. As saint Mark points out (rather cheekily, one fancies, and with, perhaps, the gentlest of irony), "he knew not what to say" (Mrk. ix,6). Commentators sometimes explain how such a reaction—one of fear mixed with fascination—is characteristic of those brought face to face, so to speak, with the divine. The mystic, we are told, trembles and cowers before God even as he experiences the impulse to draw closer to Him; and this is an exact description of the behaviour of saint Peter as it is presented to us in the Gospels.

Clearly, then, the Apostles must have descended from the mountain dazed and chastened by their experience, overpowered with a bewildering sense of the greatness of God, stupefied at the thought that He should have drawn so close to such as they

and made them the sharers of His secrets. The proof of the strength of these impressions is to be found in the emotional way in which saint Peter later wrote of that event in one of his epistles: "For we were not following after fables cunningly devised, when we made known unto you the power and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but we had been eye-witnesses of His grandeur. For He received honour and glory from God the Father, when these words came forth to Him from the majestic glory, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And this word we heard come forth from heaven, when we were together with Him on the holy mountain" (II Peter, i,17).

It was chiefly, however, as a manifestation of the "power" and the "grandeur" of Jesus that the Apostles remembered the Transfiguration, as the words of Peter clearly show. More than anything else, it seems, they recalled the terms of that declaration which the Father made to them then: "These words came forth to Him from the majestic glory, 'This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.' And this word we heard come forth from heaven;" this, and the splendid transformation of their master before their eyes: "we had been eye-witnesses of his grandeur."

In other words, their recollection of the Transfiguration was centred on Christ and not on themselves; their experience had served to bolster their faith, not their self-esteem. If they were glad to have been witnesses of Christ's glorification, it was not precisely because this made them visionaries and singled them out from their fellow disciples, but because of what that vision had taught them to see in Him whom they followed. Weak men the Apostles undoubtedly were; but they were true "followers" of the Christ. In one sense, they had generously abandoned all—their families, their own possessions, and even their own modest but cherished plans—in order to throw in their lot with an itinerant pauper. But in another sense, they had merely abandoned old ambitions for new ones, since they had found in Jesus a new object for their hopes. Humanly speaking at least, they had gambled on Him. All their own aspirations were now associated with His success. And it is only when we remember this that we can appreciate their joy at seeing Him so honoured by the Father. This vision of their master's grandeur came as a timely confirmation of their hopes, and as a strong support to their faith, for soon—during the Passion, about which Jesus had so recently spoken to them Mth. xvi,21)—their loyalty to Him would be severely tested.

Like John the Baptist, whose professed ambition was for Christ's prestige to increase and His own to decrease, the Apostles, because of the choice they had made, were "occupationally" suited to be the witnesses of such a scene. For they, too, had devoted their lives and energies to Christ, and this being so, they would understand and prize the vision of His glorification. And just as the manifestation of Jesus to the Baptist came as a climax to all his efforts to announce Christ's coming and made his activity even more effective, the Transfiguration was for Peter and James and John the crowning of their past dedication to Jesus and an incentive to withstand the trials to which their devotion would be subjected in the future.

What was timely for the Apostles is, from our point of view, timeless. The mystery, in some way which we cannot explain, retains its effectiveness. For it has the power to impress—or better, to improve—each generation of the followers of Christ in much the same way as it impressed and improved the chosen three. The spectacle of Christ transformed, which, happily, becomes so real as one reads the stark, yet moving, descriptions of it in the Gospels, is for our contemplation as well as theirs. It can still instruct, console and fortify hearts which have succumbed to the call of Christ.

All the eerie happenings associated with this mystery—the bodily transformation of Christ, His conversation with Moses and Elias, the voice of the Father and even, if less obviously, the presence of the cloud—combine to emphasise the personal status of Jesus. Without exploring the precise implications of each, it can be said that they all serve to authenticate Christ, indicating clearly that He is the fulfilment of Israel's hopes and at the same time revealing new facets of His dignity. Like those equally strange events which accompanied His Baptism, they place upon Jesus the stamp of divine approval as He sets out on a new and decisive phase of His career. When beginning His public preaching, our Lord was, at it were, introduced to mankind at the Jordan against a spectacular background of divine apparitions; and there his status as the beloved "servant" of God, sent to bring justice to the nations, was defined. Here, as the shadows of the Passion begin to fall about Him, Christ is once more declared to be the servant of God. Fleetingly the light of the Transfiguration breaks through the descending gloom, to remind His followers of the glory which the "suffering servant" will win through His meek

acceptance of pain and insult and, ultimately, of death. Thus, it is in an atmosphere of optimism that the final act of the drama of salvation begins, with this carefully-staged display of our Lord's grandeur.

Against the sombre background of priestly intrigue, popular rejection and presentiments of imminent death, there is manifested to us here a triumphant, and one might even say an imperious, Christ.

Triumphant, because the visible "transformation" of Jesus is a real, if transitory, anticipation of the glory that will be His after the Resurrection. At the Transfiguration Jesus momentarily savours a prize which He will soon definitively possess. "On awakening," says saint Luke, "they saw His glory" (Lke. ix,32). "The appearance of His face" was strangely "altered" (Lke. iv,29) as they watched, and it "shone as the sun" (Mth. xvii,2). Even His garments seemed to be drenched with the same brilliance, becoming "radiantly white" (Lke. ix,29) and taking on a dazzling hue which no fuller on earth could hope to reproduce (Mrk. ix,3). This, the Apostles realised, was a divinely exalted Jesus, made the conqueror of all human limitations at the moment when He was honoured by the Father (Cf. II Peter i,16). Fulfilled there, in part at least, was the divine promise which Isaias had made of the suffering servant: "His life laid down for guilt's atoning, he shall yet be rewarded; father of a long posterity, instrument of the divine purpose; for all his heart's anguish, rewarded in full" (Is. liii,10). And foreshadowed there was the glorious transfiguration of us all: "with faces unveiled, reflecting as in a mirror the glory of the Lord (we shall all be) transformed into his very image from glory to glory" (II Cor. iii,18). Rejoicing in Christ's Transfiguration as a pledge of His coming triumph, we also anticipate our own.

Sensitively aware of the humiliations which our Lord was to suffer during His Passion, it is a consolation for us, too, to discover here an imperious Christ. Receiving the homage of Moses and Elias, the representatives of the Old Alliance, He is shown in this vision to be the realisation of God's promises and the fulfilment of mankind's most sacred hopes. He is the "Prophet" before whom even the most exalted of Old Testament prophets must bow low; and He is the "Lawgiver" to whom Moses himself must now give place. His the power to command obedience of "men of every race and tribe and tongue," for He is, in truth, that "son of man . . . riding on the clouds of heaven"

to whom "power . . . and glory and sovereignty" was given in the prophetic vision of Daniel (Daniel vii,13). And to accentuate the lesson which the spectacle of Moses and Elias reverently conversing with Jesus taught, there was the voice of the Father, heard from the cloud to proclaim: "This is my chosen Son; hear ye Him" (Lke. ix,35). Once again, the divine "stage-effects" serve to reinforce powerfully the message of the mystery.

Both at His Baptism and Transfiguration something of the life of Jesus is revealed. At the Jordan we become aware of the hidden, trinitarian life which mysteriously animates Him; and there we see an image of what we are. But on the mountain we are overwhelmed by the glory and the power that is His; and we are meant to find in this the promise of what we shall be. Schooled by this vision, we come to know that "our country is in the heavens" and so "we eagerly await as saviour the Lord Jesus Christ, who will transform the body of our lowliness, that it may be one with the body of His glory" (Philip, iii,21). For us, as for Christ Himself, baptism must flower in transfiguration.

KEVIN WALSH.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

SHORT NOTICE

LIGHTNING MEDITATIONS, by Ronald Knox. Sheed and Ward, London, 1959. X + 164 pp. 12/6.

The author of this book is known by repute. His gift for clear and popular expression is as well known as his genius for precise and penetrating thoughts. Like his earlier volume—"Stimuli"—this book is simply a collection of some of Monsignor Knox's sermons, compiled by Philip Caraman, S.J., and entitled, very aptly, "Lightning Meditations." Each meditation or sermon is as a spiritual flash of lightning in the sense that it illuminates the dark corners of our conscience and is invariably followed by the thunder of remorse. Each sermon is like lightning in its brevity and like thunder in the weight and importance of its message. In the first 46 meditations the reader is taken on an enlightening tour of the Church's liturgical year, from Christmas to Pentecost; while the remaining 32 discuss interesting and popular highlights of Christian spirituality—a discussion obviously calculated to effect a change for the better. Both layman and priest will find this volume valuable—the one for entertaining and yet solidly spiritual reading, the other for some original thoughts on some Sunday Gospels or Epistles or other popular topics.

C.G.

Notes

SOME RECENT BOOKS

In his Proemium[1] Dr. Muldoon tells us that in trying to keep closely to the methods used by the theologians of the past, and in trying to give proper treatment to new questions in theology "moles huius voluminis me nolente volente crescebat." Actually it increased till it fills 509 pages. When you first see the book its size rather frightens you. When you have read 50 or 60 pages you are quite satisfied that this most excellent work is not a page too long. For the author is a scholar and a teacher, and not unfrequently the two are not found in the same person. There is not a revealed truth or a theological opinion concerning Our Divine Lord which he does not know and understand perfectly. And because he is a teacher he can make his reader understand and savour the truths which matter more to men than anything else in this world. He concludes his Prolegomena with the words: "Nihil gravioris momenti quam hoc, quod *de Christo recte sentiamus.* 'Haec enim est vita aeterna: ut cognoscant te, solum Deum Verum, et quem misisti Jesum Christum' qui est pro toto genere humano unica 'via, veritas et vita.' "

There is nothing which I wish to say concerning the order in which Dr. Muldoon treats his subject. The first part of his book, which occupies almost 400 of the 509 pages in the volume, deals with Our Lord—His divinity, His humanity, the union of the Divine Nature with the human nature in the Person of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity—the nature of this hypostatic union. Then the author writes of the consequences of this unique and marvellous union—of the perfection of Christ's human nature, of its sanctity, of its grace, of Christ's impeccability, of all the wonderful knowledge in the human mind of Christ and of the different ways in which this knowledge comes into His human intellect. Then the author speaks of Our Lord's human will, of its liberty and of its power. What student or priest is there who would not gain by studying these wonderful and beautiful adornments of Our Lord's human nature?

The author next speaks of the necessity of the mystery of

---

[1]Theologiae Dogmaticae Praelectiones, Vol. IV, De Verbo Incarnato Redemptore, by Most Rev. T. Muldoon, D.D. XV + 509 pp., Rome. 1960.

the Incarnation. Then he asks: Would Christ have become man if Adam had not sinned? The question is not *could* Christ have become man had there been no sin, but, from what God has revealed to us in Holy Scripture and Tradition, are we not led to believe that Our Lord became man precisely to seek and to save what was lost? Has not God revealed to us that He decreed to become man because man had sinned? Is there any reasonable and valid reason in God's revelation for thinking and believing that He would have become man even if Adam had not sinned? Dr. Muldoon, and I think correctly, thinks that it is at least more probable that in God's decree to become man there is nothing to justify us in believing that He would have become man even if Adam had not sinned.

I said that I did not wish to speak of the order in the author's treatment. What I would like to do is to show why I think this book is of outstanding use to students and to priests.

Dr. Muldoon begins, as is usual, with the thesis that Christ is true God. Everyone knows who Christ is and who God is. So, the author wastes no time with unnecessary definitions. But the word "true" cries out for comment, and here is where Dr. Muldoon shows his scholarship and his teaching ability. Beginning with Cerinthus who "divided Christ" and against whom St. John wrote his gospel, he gives us a clear and perfect picture of the attacks made on Christ's divinity by the Gnostics, Adoptianists, Arians, Socinians and so on till we come to the Rationalists of the 18th century. Dr. Muldoon has about as much patience with Voltaire, D'Holbach, Diderot and their like as Holy Scripture has with Atheists. Their "nefanda perfidia" and "detestandae contumeliae" receive the brush off for which they ask. He continues with an account of the philosophical reasoning against the divinity of Christ and the criticism of history introduced by Kant and Spinoza—the rationalists Strauss, Bauer, Renan, Wells, Russell, etc. Then he comes to the Liberal Protestants with their negation of Christ's divinity and assertion that God is *in* Christ—which opens the door for the Modernists, with their "historic Christ" and "the Christ of Faith." In all this description of those who from Cerinthus down to our present day modernists, all of whom "divide Christ" and take away from Him His divinity, Dr. Muldoon teaches us why we say that Christ is "True" God, and lets us see what a fight the Church and its theologians have had, and still have, to preserve this depositum Fidei intact and free from error.

This finished, Dr. Muldoon sets about proving his thesis from Sacred Scripture. He reminds us that we are theologians, not apologists, that we are seeking God's revelation, and that revelation is in Holy Scripture and in Tradition. He is not going to listen to or change his plan for the Liberal Protestants and modernists who try to teach us that St. John and St. Paul changed Christ by a process of idealisation. St. John's gospel and St. Paul's epistle are the word of God. So, the author begins where it is right that we should begin, with St. John's great Prologue. Here again, I wish to stress that the author does not content himself with a mere reference to St. John Ch. 1. He gives three pages to show that in his prologue, St. John teaches us three great truths about Our Lord—that *He was in the beginning*, i.e., before the world was created; that He was *with* God—that He *was* God, and that He created the world—and that Word of God, who is all those things, became man and dwelt amongst us. Then in two more pages we learn that St. John throughout his gospel, teaches us that Christ is equal with God, eternal with God, one with God, that He has common possession of the divine attributes, that He performs all the works which His Father does.

Then we have an equally masterly exposition of the fact that St. Paul speaks of the divinity of Christ, not as something to be proved, but as a truth well known to his readers—known from the catechetical instructions given by the Apostles and by Paul himself. It is a wonderful help for students and priests to realize that St. Paul's epistles have no sense unless you realize that his readers knew that Christ is God. That truth is the "milk" which St. Paul says they drank in their spiritual infancy. Now that they are grown up Paul writes to give them the "meat" which they need for their spiritual health and strength—and so he teaches them all the wonderful truths of our religion, of our redemption, of grace, of the mystical body, etc.—truths which are all dependent on the divinity of Christ. And so Dr. Muldoon from page 26 to page 32 gives us a masterly and most helpful analysis of many of the places where St. Paul teaches us that Christ is true God.

With equal clarity and thoroughness we are shown from page 35 to page 43 that the Synoptic Gospels teach us the truth of Christ's divinity.

Even a casual reader of the Gospels must wonder how St. John came to know of and to write of the Logos or Verbum Dei.

Dr. Muldoon gives us a scholion from page 58 to page 64, and he gives us an answer to those modernists who assert that St. John is merely using the word 'Logos' as Philo used it.

Our author shows us that the Stoics used the word Logos. For them, pantheists, the Logos was the soul of the world, God —and what a god? He was identical with and one with the material world.

The Neoplatonists spoke of the Logos as one less than God and more than man—but essentially a creature and not God. Philo, a faithful Jew, could have nothing to do with the pantheistic Logos of the Stoics. His doctrine is, Dr. Muldoon tells us, a congeries confusa et contradictoria in which the Logos is, and is not, almost everything under the sun. Quid haec omnia ad lucidam doctrinam Joannis de Verbo Divino?

On page 65 the author comes to the *essence* of the Doctrine of the Incarnation, and he sets out to show us that Christ is one Person, a Divine Person, subsisting in two complete and distinct natures—a Union which is absolutely unique and supernatural, rightly called the Hypostatic Union. From page 70 to page 83 he gives us a clear account of the efforts made by Nestorius, Eutyches and others to destroy the Catholic teaching on the Hypostatic Union—they assert that Christ is *morally* one person, that Christ has only one nature, that Christ has only one Will—and here we are given the clearest possible account of the famous letter of Pope Honorius to Sergius. All this account of the heretical teachings against which the Church fought is terminated with the definitions of the Oecumenical Council in 680-681, which brought to a triumphant conclusion the struggle between Christ and His enemies.

After having proved the thesis that Christ is one Person subsisting in two complete and distinct natures, and that the union between these two natures is personal, subsistential, hypostatic, not moral or accidental, Dr. Muldoon tackles the very difficult question: What is that formal element which makes a nature a person? Whatever the answer be, it is clear that this element is not present in the human nature of Our Lord, else He would be a human person.

Dr. Muldoon gives the main differing opinions on this subject. He examines them, criticises them and then proposes and defends the opinion that the human nature of Christ is not a human person because, although it is a complete nature, it has not its own proper human existence. At the instant of its

creation it was assumed into the Divine existence of the Son of God. Christ's human nature belongs to a Divine Person, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, because it is taken into the Divine Existence, precisely as this existence is incommunicably proper to the Word of God. Some theologians object, saying that the Divine esse or existence is common to the Three Divine Persons. Therefore, they say, logically one must admit that the Three Divine Persons became man. Let those who are interested in this important and difficult question open Dr. Muldoon's book at page 227 and they will see, not *how* the human nature of Christ is received into the Divine Personal Existence of the Word of God—that is a mystery and will always remain one—but they will see that such a personal union involves no contradiction and that no one can show that it is impossible.

I fear that I have been giving rather a precis of our author's work than a review. My purpose is to show that Dr. Muldoon has given us a book which meets the needs of students and of priests. One could go right through his work, but I think I have done enough—if not too much—to show how very thoroughly and how very clearly Dr. Muldoon has written. In his Proemium he writes that indeed we know only in part, we think and speak as do children—but as we look up to Christ, the author, sustainer and finisher of our faith, we cannot rest, but we must search and enquire ever deeper, that we may understand better the great mystery of His Person and of His work—and understanding we may love Him with ever stronger love. Most certainly in this great work, the result of great study and application, the fruit of great ability, Dr. Muldoon has given us a work of very great merit and value.

J. MEAGHER, S.J.

Corpus Christi College, Glen Waverley, Victoria.

* * * * *

It is over fifty years since Dom Baur, O.S.B., published his first book on St. John Chrysostom at Louvain. From 1907 the German scholar has devoted much attention to the great saint of Antioch, and his supreme work, *John Chrysostom and His Time,* at long last has appeared in English, translated by an American nun, Sister M. Gonzaga, R.S.M.[1] A translation one has the right to

[1] *John Chrysostom and His Time,* vol. 1, Antioch, by C. Baur, O.S.B. Sands and Co. London and Glasgow, 1959. LXXV + 399 pages. 30/-.

demand should be accurate; it is curious, however, to see the translator leaving in Dom Baur's preface the phrase: *My revered teacher, Professor Cauchie (Löwen)*, failing to translate the German name of Louvain; the name Dom Leclercq is mis-spelt on p. LIV; while Gustave Bardy's book on Paul of Samosata is cited, not in the second and emended edition of 1929, but in the earlier edition; the place of publication of Nutting, *A History of Nursing*, 1907-12, is not given. When an important book is translated, it is most disappointing to find notes and bibliographical material in the original either left out, or treated in a very cavalier fashion. Let us hasten at once to say that this is not the case in the present book—and the labour and expense of printing 75 pages of the Sources and Literature on St. John Chrysostom are a tribute to the serious purpose of the translator and the publisher.[2]

John Chrysostom was a man of two cities, Antioch and Constantinople, so it is natural that this first volume deals with the period of his life at Antioch.

Only scraps of his early life are known to history, eked out by the few references of contemporary writers. Born into a Christian family, nurtured and educated by his wonderful mother, Anthusa, a girl widow, John was always good and docile. His mother was not afraid to send her son to the lecture room of Libanius, the pagan rhetorician and friend of Julian the Apostate "In Antioch itself," Dom Baur writes, "the first and greatest orator of Christian antiquity sat at the feet of the last great rhetorician of pagan antiquity."

After his baptism and a short spell of monastic solitude, John came back to Antioch, a city of beauty and squalor that Dom Baur celebrates with real ecclesiastical fervour, where he was ordained priest, protesting his unworthiness in the best known of his books, *On the Priesthood*. Henceforth his life's work was preaching. Endowed by nature, enriched by education, he developed by practice his superb gifts—simplicity, colour, good taste. Puech makes the point that John was more the moralist than the speculative theologian, which Dom Baur somewhat resents. Yet in that theologically minded fourth century of Arianism, it is refreshing to meet a great moralist, who knew

---

[2]Unhappily we have to advise the reader that overseas reviewers have written harshly about the standard and accuracy of the translation.

with sympathy the pulsating life of the great city, and firmly but kindly leads men and women back to Christ's law.

A preacher in that century was almost the sole privileged commentator on people and life. John, whom posterity was to dub Chrysostom, "the golden-mouth," was small, with a weak voice, but his oratory was "like the cataract of the Nile." He stands supreme in the Greek Church, although St. Gregory Nazianzen's *Farewell* sermon to the Council of Constantinople and the Church of the capital must rank him very high. Bossuet, Newman—a very few other names would be added to that lonely, superb list, because at the top criticism must be over severe. Dom Baur writes very well indeed of Chrysostom as a pulpit orator, a chapter that all who practise the difficult art will find illuminating. Bossuet, it is said, demanded a great subject—the collapse of an empire, the death of a monarch—before his oratory could begin its majestic, sweeping rhythm; in his old age, the Bishop of Meaux emptied the church with his Sunday by Sunday sermons. Chrysostom seemed able, however, to deal with all subjects, but his great series on the *Statues* owes a good deal to the occasion. A fickle Antiochian crowd, angry over some tax, threw down the statues of Theodosius and of members of the imperial family. As they cooled down, the people began to fear the terrible anger of the Emperor; chariots crowded with the treasures of the lucky ones clattered out of the doomed city; the racecourses and theatres were deserted; Antioch became religious overnight. Chrysostom's sermons are a living document in which he paints the fears, hopes, sudden joy, overwhelming sorrow, of his fellow townsmen. Such sermons are literature. In this rich book, Dom Baur gives us the fruit of a life devoted to the great orator. Constantinople had ever ambitioned the best of Antioch: Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Nestorius. It broke all three. We are promised a second volume by Dom Baur which will tell us of the greatness and misery of Chrysostom's sojourn in the great city, and it is to be hoped the translation is worthy of Dom Baur's fine book.

The translation of Berthold Altaner's *Patrology* (translated by Hilda C. Graef. Nelson, Edinburgh-London, 1960. XXIV + 660 pp.) is an event of importance. Up to a few years ago there was very little in English on patrology. Then notably Professor Quasten gave us the first two volumes of his promised series of four; the wait for the next volume on the fourth century writers

has been long and painful. And now we have a most competent version of the fifth German edition of Professor Altaner's well known *Patrologie*. A comparison made between Dr. Graef's translation and an earlier German edition (the fourth) shows how carefully she has translated, and brings home, too, the wide interest and constant activity in patristics. Altaner gives the reader a complete survey in 660 pages; Quasten is to take four volumes to cover the same field. Altaner has the German method of giving the salient facts—the life of the writer and his works—followed by abundant bibliographies, which he is continually keeping up to date by fresh editions. He concludes his notice with a brief account of the writer's doctrine (much briefer than Quasten, who made his book so valuable by his long discussion of the teaching and theology of the various ecclesiastical writers of antiquity). Altaner's book will be welcomed by scholars for his rich bibliographical information, and one feels that it will win a wide number of readers among students, as it is a handy, compact guide to patrology. That is not to say that our patient waiting for Professor Quasten's third volume is going to be abandoned. Both books will be of the utmost advantage.

Professor Hubert Jedin has paused in his work on his monumental *History of the Council of Trent* to indulge in something that might be called a scholarly scoop. With the twenty-first Ecumenical Council in the air. he has written a most competent precis of conciliar history in his *Ecumenical Councils in the Catholic Church* (Nelson, Edinburgh-London. 245 pp. 1960. 21/-). A better short account of what happened at the twenty councils from Nicaea (325) to the Vatican Council (1869-70) could hardly be imagined. Professor Jedin has the power not only to impart exact information, but also to interest the reader in the doings of long ago councils. More space is given to the seven councils of antiquity (Nicaea 325 to II Nicaea 787), the IV Lateran (1215), the Council of Trent (1545-63) and the Vatican Council (1869-70) than to the brief, and to our minds, puzzling medieval councils. His pages on Trent and the Vatican are masterly. His valuable little book concludes, as becomes a professor, with a brief bibliography of editions of the acts of the various councils and of the historical studies devoted to them, which is of extreme interest coming from such a source. On the Vatican Council Jedin considers that Granderath has written the best general account, while Professor R. Aubert, of Louvain, has in his book, *Le Pontificat de Pie IX* (1952) given us the best short account.

It is interesting to note, too, that Jedin used *The Vatican Council: The Story from inside told in Bishop Ullathorne's letters* (1930), which, he writes, "served me as an invaluable source for quotations." A great many questions are going to be asked in the near future about councils, so this little book would be a good 'buy.'

T. VEECH.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

Book Reviews

THEOLOGIAE DOGMATICAE PRAELECTIONES: *Volumen III: De Deo Creante et Elevante.* Thomas Muldoon, S.T.D. xvi, 418 pp. Romae, Officium Libri Catholici, 1959.

The lectures summarized in this third volume of the Most Rev. Dr. Muldoon's now well-known work were, as his Preface indicates, given in the Sydney Theological Faculty at Manly, N.S.W., in 1957. Their subject, God the Author of the natural and the super-natural, comprises a wide variety of fundamental and interesting questions.

The distinguished author, who has since become Auxiliary Bishop to Cardinal Gilroy, states that the work was intended for beginners in Theology and that his sole aim was clarity of exposition for their sake. He has achieved this aim with outstanding success. While not neglecting positive Theology, the author leans strongly to the *ratio theologica,* and the chief merit of the work is the lucid and lively presentation of this. One can well believe that there was not a dull moment in Dr. Muldoon's classes.

The theological teaching here presented is in the main the *doctrina communis.* First in order comes the deep subject of creation.

On the philosophical point about eternal creation, the author falls in with St. Thomas, Scotus, Molina, etc., in holding that creation *ab aeterno* is speculatively possible. It was for this reason, by the way, that St. Thomas warned apologists not to attempt to demonstrate creation on the ground that the world must have had a beginning.

The hexaemeron is accepted by Bishop Muldoon as a literary form to express impressively the truths that God made and ordered all things and that man should rest on the day sacred to Him. This is far from saying that the account of the work of the six days is simply a profane myth.

On transformism, the author maintains that evolution within certain limits is tenable as an hypothesis, and this reservation makes the position safe. On the question of fact, as far as man's body is concerned, he teaches, of course, that the first man's body was made by God from non-living matter and also that the first woman was made from material from that man.

The angels are dismissed in twenty-nine pages, and in a general treatise of this size that seems sufficient proportionately. In a field where the mediaeval scholastics exercised their genius, the author *sapit ad sobrietatem.*

The thorny question of divine premotion and created free-will is treated at some length. When reading Dr. Muldoon's sketch of the history of the famous controversy between

Dominicans and Jesuits in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, reaching its apex in the "Congregationes de Auxiliis," one feels the spirit of the debate. He is opposed to decisive premotion (praedeterminatio physica).

This is a stimulating text, and, with its predecessors by the same distinguished author, it forms a milestone in the theological literature of this country.

C.R.

* * *

APPARITIONS OF OUR LADY: THEIR PLACE IN THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH, by Louis Lochet. Edinburgh, 1960. Thomas Nelson & Sons. IX + 127 pp. 25/-.

This book is a translation by John Dingle of an original French edition published in 1957. Father Lochet writes not as a theologian but as a believer who accepts these apparitions. In a simple style which should appeal to all readers he sets out to show the place of Our Lady's apparitions in the revelation of the mystery of Mary, in the life of the Church, and in the life of the individual Christian.

The apparitions are only a stage in the revelation of the mystery of Mary, and a means of fulfilling her God-given role of drawing all men to her divine Son. She is the exemplar and a source of confidence for men in their approach to God, for she too is a creature, and achieved her exalted state only by co-operation with God's grace.

The miracles and wonders worked at the shrines of Our Lady's apparitions are intended as sensible aids to the life of faith, creating an atmosphere in which the spirit of Christ, as revealed in the gospels, may be fostered in the present generation. They are a sign of the personal intervention of God calling us to an inner conversion of heart, and guiding us on our own heavenly pilgrimage to God. Christ comes to us through Mary, thus explaining why the Eucharist is the fulcrum of life at the shrines.

Modern man has rejected God, but through the apparitions of Mary, the goodness of God is revealed as He calls us to filial submission, to have faith, and to place our hope of future glory in Him.

The means we should employ to find God are prayer and penance. Our prayer should be in union with Our Lady, the Mother of the whole Christ, for the salvation of all the world. It should be made in a spirit of faith, placing our confidence on our inadequacy before God.

The ultimate purpose of the apparitions is to lead the world back to Christ in His Mystical Body, the Church, and to inspire

us with love and zeal in His service. The author unites Our Lady's mission to the cause of Christ and thus keeps the correct order of relations, to Christ through Mary.

The chief message of the apparitions, prayer and penance, again finds expression; but in a refreshing new atmosphere. Gone is any suggestion of sentimentality for the complete devotion is given a sound theological basis. Such an approach is welcomed when the shrines are inclined to be surrounded with sentimentality.

The deep but simple spirituality of the book will stir any reader and the obvious sincerity of the author shines through the pages as a further source of inspiration.

B.C.

* * * * *

LIFE OF UNION WITH MARY, by Emil Neubert, S.M. (U.S.A. Bruce Publishing Co. 1959. 255 pp. 51/- A.)

We feel as we read this book that we are in the hands of a good guide—an experienced theologian and devoted child of Our Lady. As a member of the justly esteemed Marist Order of priests, his religious life has been nourished on devotion to Mary. His own supernatural and natural gifts have led him far along the spiritual road which he now, towards the last years of his long life, shares with us. This book was written in French and published in Paris in 1954. We are fortunate in having it in the smooth translation of Father S. P. Juergens, S.M.

Father Neubert's thesis of union with Mary fits in naturally with the life of anyone who, longing for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, has taken as a motto the scriptural words "persevering in prayer with Mary the Mother of Jesus." We did not notice that particular text as we read his book but it surely is there, for it came easily to our mind as we read.

Our author states clearly that Mary has meaning only in relation to Jesus; and he shows that the mysteries of Mary —her Immaculate Conception, her Virginity, her Divine Maternity, and all the others—derive their purpose and meaning from the relations of Mary with Jesus. He quotes, in this regard, the words of St. Pius X: "No one in the world knew Jesus as Mary did; no one is a better teacher and a better guide for making Jesus known. . . ." There is a touching remark attributed to the saintly Irish dock worker, Mat Talbot. He was asked how he, without education, could possibly understand the scriptures and the spiritual books he read. His reply was: "Before reading a book I always ask the Blessed Virgin for the grace of understanding what I read."

This book is in harmony with the spiritual trends of to-day.

If one may speak of a *zeit-geist* in these sacred matters, then it may be applied to the devotion to Mary, which is the spirit blowing through our century. Most of the great converts of recent years, in every country, give eloquent testimony to this affirmation.

M.O.

* * * * *

CATHOLICS AND DIVORCE, Ed. by Patrick J. O'Mahony; Thomas Nelson and Sons, London, 1959; 116 pp.; 12/6 stg.

It is only a few months since the Uniform Divorce Bill has raised again in the minds of many Australians the Catholic attitude to marriage and divorce. The question is likely to remain a topical one as new legislation for uniform marriage laws is scheduled for this year. So this up-to-date symposium on "Catholics and Divorce" could not have arrived in Australia at a better time. For many people it will provide a clear and compact presentation of the Church's teachings on this subject.

The Editor makes it quite clear that his book is not an exposition of the whole marriage tract, but rather "a concise, thorough and non-technical statement about the stability of the marriage bond." For this purpose he has enlisted the help of seven well-known English authors who cover the field very thoroughly. The articles are arranged in three broad sections, the first considering the marriage bond in Scripture and Tradition, the second the social evils that divorce entails, and the third the important question of the Church's power over the bond of marriage.

The Scriptural basis for the Church's doctrine is presented clearly by the Editor himself. On the question of the exceptive clause in St. Matthew he follows the opinion of Father Vaccari, interpreting the "fornication" as an invalid union. Mgr. Davis treats indissolubility more from the dogmatic side, deriving it principally from the union of Christ with His Church as presented by St. Paul. In a comparatively long chapter John Coyne analyses Tradition in considering the attitude of the Church down to the Reformation.

Two notable contributors are Their Lordships Dr. Heenan and Dr. Beck. Between them they give us a statistical account of the growth of divorce in England, and the social evils that are marring family life. Their figures may be drawn from Great Britain, but they would still give us a general guide to the position here in Australia.

The most difficult chapter of the book falls to L. L. McReavy, who explains and defends the power that the Church exercises over the natural bond of marriage. He treats of the Pauline Privilege quite convincingly, but is not as satisfactory with cases of non-consummation or "in favorem fidei." In fact he makes no

mention of the recent increase in the number of "in favorem" cases, nor does he try to explain the changes in the Church's attitude that have made this increase possible. The importance of this question should have merited for it more space than the author gave it. The final chapter, by John Humphreys, explains the nature of the impediments to marriage and the process in ecclesiastical courts for decrees of nullity.

The use of so many collaborators makes for freshness and variety in style, and this impression is also helped by the clear layout of the book. Its claim to be a "concise, thorough and non-technical" presentation of Catholic teaching on divorce is not an empty boast. Many priests should find it useful as a clear and practical summary of the question, but above all it should answer the problems of Catholic laymen and even sincere non-Catholic inquirers.

G.P.I.

* * * * *

MOTHER OF PERPETUAL SUCCOUR MANUAL, compiled by Rev. J. Cummins, C.SS.R.; 301 pp. Ballarat, 1960.

Just five years after the picture of the Mother of Perpetual Succour was restored to public veneration after being hidden away for 68 years, Pope Pius IX sanctioned a petition for the erection of a confraternity under the invocation of Our Lady of Perpetual Succour and St. Alphonsus. This Confraternity has become widely spread, having 4017 affiliated branches in 1958. In Australia it has developed mainly as a pious union for women, both married and single. Having noted the good done by the Confraternity, Father Cummins was urged to draw up a new and complete manual of prayers and direction.

Though this book is primarily a handbook for members of this Confraternity containing its rules and devotions, yet it has many sections of instruction and a large number of prayers and pious practices that could be most useful to the average Catholic.

It begins with the history and explanation of the Miraculous Picture, a coloured print of which makes a beautiful frontispiece of the book itself. The prayers and devotions of the Confraternity are suitable for use at any time, and besides, the book gives quite a number of other exercises in honour of the Blessed Virgin, particularly taken from the writings of St. Alphonsus. The Perpetual Novena, so popular in many parishes, is also incorporated.

Being pocket size the book could be used as an ordinary prayer book, having all the usual Catholic practices well arranged, along with ample instruction on Confession, Holy Communion, and especially the Mass.

The Ordinary of the Mass is so set out that it caters for

users who attend the Dialogue Mass, clearly indicating the parts to be recited by the congregation, and having the pauses marked. The Proper of the Masses of Our Lady and St. Alphonsus are given in full. Also the Mass for the Dead is completely set out again, with the Proper of the three Requiem Masses, besides the Absolution. In addition the Nuptial Mass and Blessing are included.

Besides the Way of the Cross, with Monsignor Knox's translation of the verses of the Stabat Mater, the book contains about 40 hymns.

This little book could prove helpful to many, particularly those familiar with the Redemptorist devotions, and foster their own devotion to Our Lady of Perpetual Succour.

W.V.

* * * * *

THE SUPREME MODERATOR OF CLERICAL EXEMPT RELIGIOUS INSTITUTES, by Maurice J. Grajewski, O.F.M. The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1957.

This carefully planned work was written as a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Canon Law. Its first part is a useful and very clear historical conspectus of religious life to the thirteenth century, directed particularly to showing the evolution of the position of supreme moderator. This part is well done, and is supported by a good documentation. One could complain about some small things, including the author's paraphrastic translation of, ". . . denn das Moenchtum als Stand setzt die Differenzierung der Gemeindeglieder nach dem verschiedenen Mass der religioesen Hingabe voraus," as, ". . . the religious state, which of its very nature presupposes divergent forms of life dependent upon the conditions of time and place. . . ." (p. 4). It is not at all clear what the English means, though the German ("monasticism supposes differences of devotion"—for which "vocation" would have been a better word) is clear enough.

In Part Two the author, in a clear division of the matter, deals successively with the authority of the supreme moderator, the person of the supreme moderator of clerical exempt religious institutes, the legislative power of the supreme moderator, his judicial power, his executive power. The first of these headings provides a good treatment of jurisdiction and of dominative power, and of the nature and extent of the authority of the supreme moderator. In the section on the legislative power, one can commend especially the treatment of precepts and dispensations; and in the section on executive power, the excellent handling of the council and the general chapter. The section on the executive power concludes with special questions: the reservation of sins, the prohibition of books, the supervision of

studies, the affiliation of tertiaries. The author has useful remarks to make throughout on the many matters which the Code leaves for determination by Rules and Constitutions and on the responsibility placed personally on the supreme moderator.

There seem to be some faulty illations in various parts of the book. For instance: on p. 52, the two sentences beginning, "Not all authority . . ."; and on p. 144-145: "Since the higher superior can appoint the provincial to office, by the same token he can remove him for a just cause,"—the fact may be true, but it does not follow "by the same token." On p. 156, the two sentences beginning, "Some canonists are of the opinion," presented as a complete disjunction, are plainly on the face of them not a disjunction. Probably the author means in the first sentence not, "the council must be consulted," but, "the council's consent must be obtained."

There is no little redundancy at times, points being repeated after apparently having been made once for all. See, for example, the last two paragraphs on p. 74, and again at the top of p. 75; and the first paragraph of p. 82 compared with the preceding page. Some inaccurate statements are made. For example, on p. 156: "Among these reserved sins cannot be included those which already are reserved to the Apostolic See, even by reason of censure, or those for which a censure, even though not reserved to anyone, is imposed by law"—c. 898 inserts the word "regulariter" before the second of these classes; and on p. 162: "Canonically, an Order is an organized religious body of men living according to a strictly defined and approved Rule and governed by Constitutions, confirmed by the Holy See, under the authority of one Supreme Moderator"—canonically, to-day, that does not fulfil the definition of an Order (c. 488. 2).

Most notable of all is the omission of religious in simple perpetual vows in the section on dismissal of religious. The part of the supreme moderator in the dismissal of religious with temporary vows, and with solemn vows is treated: of the others nothing is said. Furthermore, the statement follows, evidently as a result, that "a canonical trial is usually required by the Code for the dismissal of men religious professed with solemn vows" (p. 153; "usually"—that is, as the author points out, except for the cases under c. 646 and c. 668). Such a trial, however, is of course also required for those with perpetual simple vows in a clerical exempt institute; and it is not required for those with solemn vows in a lay institute (c. 649, 654).

Some of the supporting references appear to be adduced too lightly. For example, c. 494 §2 does not authorize the statement on p. 132-133 ("If, however, the general chapter cannot be held, or if problems arise in the interim between chapters, its powers devolve upon the supreme moderator with his council"), where the author is speaking of powers in general.

In view of these faults, one can criticize all the more severely the cavalier dismissal of Vermeersch-Creusen's opinion as "untenable," after producing against it only the inconclusive wording of the Code, with no argumentation or supporting reference (p. 155).

There are some very awkward sentence-constructions at times. The work as a whole has much to commend it and can be helpful, but falls well below its promise.

F.P.K.

LIVING PARISH SERIES

11 ELIOT St., BUNBURY, W.A.

BOX 3609, G.P.O., SYDNEY

"The People's Spoken Mass"

An aid for parish participation

- English and Latin in graduated stages.
- Structure of the Mass clearly marked by explanatory headings.
- In booklet or on card: 6d. Celloglassed card: 1/3.

Write for samples, catalogue.

Store: 24 JOHN ST., ASHFIELD. Telephone: UA 4203.